

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

FOR

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1815:

VOL. XII.

ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χεῖρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἅ μὴ νοέεις.

ΕΡΙΘ. ΙΝΣΕΡΤ.

T

London :

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
TOWER'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; RICHARDSON,
SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER ROW;
UNDERWOOD, FLEET-STREET; PARKER, OX-
FORD; DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; MACRE-
DIE AND CO. EDINBURGH; AND
ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS. ‡

1815.

*The copies to be printed will be limited to the number
of Subscribers*

FOR THE NEW AND IMPROVED EDITION

OF

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus,

To be edited by A. J. VALPY, A. M. late Fellow of Pemb. College, Oxford; and Mr. E. H. BARKER, of Trin. College, Cambridge.

To be printed at Mr. A. J. Valpy's Press, London.

The work will be published in Parts, at 1*l.* 1*s.* each—large paper 2*l.* 2*s.* each. To be completed in 3 years. It is expected that the Work will be comprised in 24 Nos.

Persons desirous of Subscribing are respectfully requested to send their names to Mr A. J. Valpy, Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane; and to appoint a Correspondent in London to receive each Number, and pay the amount of the Subscription.

A correct List of Subscribers' Names will be recorded in the Work; and each Subscriber will have his own name only printed in red ink, which may hereafter render his copy of more value to his family or friends.

The Number already subscribed are 73 *large* and 846 *small*; a List of which, together with the Materials for the Improvement of the New Edition, is inserted in Nos. XIX. and XX. of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL; and may be had gratis at all the Classical Booksellers in London; and at Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane.

The Subscription will soon be closed.

No. I. will be published in *October*, 1815.

CONTENTS OF No. XXIII.

BISHOP Pearson's Minor Tracts, chronologically arranged,	
No. IV.	1
Remarks on Dr. Johnson's Latin Epitaph on Mr. Thrale.	6
Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674 cum Odyssea editionis Ernestinæ, No. V.	7
Remarks on Latin Metre.	10
Notice of Mr. J. Jones' Grammar of the Greek Tongue.	23
Notice of Brunck's Anacreon, edited by G. H. Schaefer.	27
Observationes Criticæ in Euripidem.	30
Account of the Prices and Purchasers of the most valuable articles in the collection of the late J. Edwards, Esq.	35
Inquiry into the causes of the Diversity of Human Character in various Ages, Nations, and Individuals. By the late Professor Scott, No. VI.	41
Biblical Synonyma, No. IV.	67
A passage in Cicero's Cato Major illustrated.	73
Answer to Mr. Bellamy's Essay on the Hebrew Points, and on the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, No. III.	77
On the different Latin Poetical expressions to render the English verb <i>to run</i>	84
Remarks on Mr. Blomfield's edition of the Persæ of Æschylus. ..	90
Bentleii Emendationes Ineditæ in Aristophanem—In Ranas, No. III.	104
On the 77th verse of the Hippolytus.	111
The gallantry of Saladin and his Brother Malek Adel. By Mr. Hammer.	112

Recherches Sur Apollon, et sur divers points de Grammaire ; par J. B. Gail	115
Notice of Collatio Versionis Syriacæ quam Peschito vocant, cum Fragmentis in Commentariis Ephraemi Syri obviis instituta a M. Gottl. Leb. Spohn.	124
Answer to a late book written against the Learned and Reve- rend Dr. Bentley, with an examination of Mr. Bennett's Appen- dix to the said book. No. v.	128
Wallace, a Cambridge Prize Poem.	145
Observations on the "Remarks in Sir W. Drummond's Disserta- tion on Gen. xlix."	149
Richardi Bentleii Epistolæ Duæ ad Ti. Hemsterhusium.	157
On the Margites of Homer.	161
Dr. Crombie's Remarks on the notice of his Gymnasium, sive Symbola Critica, No. II.	167
The Life of Isaac Casaubon.	172
Ode Græca, In Obitum Gul. Craven, D. D. Coll. Div. Joan. Capt. haud ita pridem dignissimi Magist.	184
Cambridge Prize Poems, for 1815.	186
Sir William Browne's Medals.	191
Biblical Criticism.	193
Lockett's Arabic Syntax.	194
Notice of Tiberius Rhetor de Figuris, una cum Rufi Arte Rhetor- ica. Edidit Jo. Fr. Boissonade.	198
On the word Palimpsestus.	204
Cambridge Prize Poem for 1790—Ode Latina.	206
On the Prosody of Greek Verse, as connected with dialect.	208
Adversaria Literaria.	209
Mots, ou Omis par H. Etienne, ou inexactement expliqués, Par J. B. Gail.	215
Literary Intelligence.	220
Notes to Correspondents.	235

CONTENTS OF No. XXIV.

BIBLICAL Criticism	237
Notice of <i>Utriusque Leonidæ Carmina</i> , Ed. Alb. Christ. Meineke. Lips.	239
Notice of Hamilton's General Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures, &c.	240
Oratio Habita Cantabrigiæ: octavo Kalendas Junii MDCCLV. Perorante Gul. Maskelyne, A. M.	241
Remarks on 1 Tim. iii. 16.	247
Remarks on the Meaning of the Hebrew word מליץ	250
Remarks on the Defence of Gabriel Sionita	254
Remarks on some Statements of the Rt. Hon. Sir W. Drummond	256
Arabian Tales, originally Persian	259
Momi Miscellanea Subseciva, No. III.	261
Inquiry into the Causes of the Diversity of Human Character in various Ages, Nations, and Individuals, by PROFESSOR SCOTT, No. VII	263
Prometheus. An English Prize Poem: Spoken at the Apposi- tion, St. Paul's School. April, 1815	273
Remarks on the Cambridge MS. of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles	276
Notice of Rich's Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon	287
Biblical Criticism: Hebrew Descent of the Abyssinians	293
On the Greek and Latin Accents. No. III.	304
De Lectione <i>Κηροπλάστας</i> in Archilochi Fragm. ap. Plutarchum	305
An Inquiry into the Nature and Efficacy of Imitative Versifica- tion, Ancient, and Modern	329
D. Heinsii Oratio De Utilitate, quæ e lectione Tragœdiarum per- cipitur	340

In Carmina Epodica Æschylea Commentarius. Auctore Cr. B.	344
Bentleii Emendationes ineditæ in Aristophanem in Equites	352
Classical Criticism	367
An Answer to a late Book written against the learned and Rev. Dr. Bentley, relating to some MS. Notes on Callimachus, together with an Examination of Mr. Bennet's Appendix to the said Book. Concluded	370
Notice of Frey's Hebrew, Latin, and English Dictionary	381
Notice of Dr. H. Marsh's Horæ Pelagicæ	383
E. H. Barkeri Epistola ad G. H. Schæferum De quibusdam He- sychi et Etymologici Glossis	393
Notice of Poetæ Minores Græci. Edidit Th. Gaisford	410
Notule Quædam in Platonis Menexenium	415
Notice of a Grammar of the Persian Language. By M. Lums- den, LL. D.	429
Notice of the Megha Duta, by Calidasa; translated from the Sanskrit by H. H. Wilson	432
Biblical Criticism	436
Bentleii Epistolæ duæ ad Ti. Hemsterhusium, No. II.	438
Adversaria Literaria, No. VIII.	450
ἈΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ἈΙΤΑΩΝ ἘΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ, sive Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, auctore Jo. Juello, olim Episcopo Sa- risb. Græce quidem reddita a Jo. Smith, A. B. Nuper recen- suit et notas addidit A. C. Campbell, A. M.	456
Mots ou omis par H. Etienne, ou inexactement expliqués. Par J. B. Gail, No. II.	463
Euripides Emendatus	467
Virgil explained	470
Prices of some of the Principal Books of the celebrated Library of Ralph Willett, Esq	473
Literary Intelligence	479
Notes to Correspondents	485

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

N^o. XXIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1815.



BISHOP PEARSON'S MINOR TRACTS
CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

No. IV.—*Continued from No. XIX. p. 99.*

NO. VIII.

NO NECESSITY
OF
REFORMATION
OF THE
PUBLICK DOCTRINE
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
By JOHN PEARSON, D. D.
LONDON:

Printed by J. G. for Nathaniel Brook, at the Angel in Cornhill.
1660.

N^o. XXIII.

Cl. JI.

VOL. XII.

A

NO. IX.

AN
ANSWER
TO
Dr. BURGESS
HIS
W O R D,
BY WAY OF
POSTSCRIPT.

In Vindication of No Necessity of Reformation of the Publick Doctrine
of the *Church of England*.

BY
JOHN PEARSON, D. D.¹

LONDON:

Printed by J. C., for Nathaniel Brook at the Angel in Cornhill.
1660.

NO. X.

CRITICI SACRI:²
SIVE
DOCTISSIMORUM VIRORUM
IN
SS. BIBLIA
ANNOTATIONES,
&
TRACTATUS.

*Opus summâ curâ recognitum, & In novem Tomos divisum.
Quid in hoc Opere præstitum sit Præfatio ad Lectorem ostendit*

LONDINI,

Excudebat JACOBUS FLESHER, MDCLX.

Prostant apud	{	CORNÆLIUM BEE	} <i>Londini</i>
		RICHARDUM ROYSTON	
		GUILIELMUM WELLS	
		SAMUELEM THOMSON	
		THOMAM ROBINSON <i>Oxonii</i> .	
	{	GUILIELMUM MORDEN <i>Cantabrigiæ</i> .	

¹ These two pamphlets were reprinted by Dr. George Hicks, in his *Bibl. Script. Eccl. Anglicanæ*, Vol. 1. Lond. 1709.—T. K.

² Dr. Pearson was the principal of four persons engaged in this Work. T. K.

SERENISSIMO
 POTENTISSIMOQUE PRINCIPI
 CAROLO SECUNDO,
 MAGNÆ BRITANNIÆ, FRANCIÆ, ET HIBERNIÆ
 REGI,
 FIDEI DEFENSORI,
 BONARUM LITERARUM PATRONO,
 PACIS ET INCOLUMITATIS
 PUBLICÆ INSTAURATORI CUSTODIQUE,
 CORNELIUS BEE
 MAJESTATI EJUS DEVOTISSIMUS
 D. D. D.

LECTORI
 PIO ET ERUDITO.

PRODIIT nuper, et nunc inter manus hominum versatur, Librorum optimus, *BIBLIA* scilicet ἸΙΟΑΤΤΑΩΤΤΑ, editionem feliciter procurante Viro admodum Reverendo *BRIANO WALTONO, S. T. D.*, aliisque Viris Cl. de Religione et S. literis quàm optimè meritis: En jam prodit tibi, Lector pie et erudite, (Tibi enim soli utrinque et seriatur et metitur, tibi soli utrunque prelum insudavit, et Waltonianum, et Nostrum) prodit, inquam, Liber (si ita loqui fas sit) δεύτερόπρωτος, primo tantum posterior, ὀπίσθιόςque proximus, *CRITICI* nimirum *SACRI*. Quid enim post literas natas melius, quid optabilius, quàm ut primum S. Scripturæ Textus originales nã cum Versionibus antiquis ὑπὸ μιᾶν σύνοψιν redigerentur, adeo ut simul ac semel omnia et conspici et conferri possent; dein et ejusdem S. Scripturæ sensus, quem vocant, Literalis et Grammaticus, qui ipsissima Scriptura est atque ipsummet Dei Verbum, a Viris eruditione, ingenio, judicio instructissimis crueretur? Illud autem Viri quos modò dixi, Viri sæpius, semper mendi, randi, summa cum accuratione ante triennium præstiterunt; Hoc verò præcipuè *CORNELII BEE*, hominis ad antiquiores melioresque literas juvandas nati, curæ et impensè acceptum ferimus. Is enim verè σεβασμύμος quicquid vel ex snapte peritiâ vel ex indicatione alienâ dignum compererat, id omne sedulò conquisitum in hunc Thesaurum Sacrum, in hanc Catenam Biblicam, vel, si mavis (nec enim facile est tantum Opus satis amplo titulo cohonestare) in hanc Bibliothecam Hagio-Criticam,* sicut Apis puro distendit nectare cellas, congressit et in tuos usus recondidit. Enimvero quotquot uspiam ἀξιωματικωτέρω in Divinis Voluminibus occurrunt, Res, Personæ, Actiones, Loca, Tempora, Regiones, Urbes, Tempia, Instrumenta, Vasa, Pondera, Mensuræ, Nummi, Habitus, Gestus, Munera, Ritus, Leges, Consuetudines, omnia, doctè hîc et dilucidè enarrantur. Hîc non solum explicantur Typorum mysteria, Prophetiarum et Parabolarum ænigmata, adeoque universa S. Textûs loca difficiliora, quin et insuper vocum ipsarum origines, usus, significata, imò apices nonnunquam et minutissimæ

pensculatibus examinantur. Hic exhibetur quicquid ad Divinas paginas vel Synagogæ Rabbiſi vel Ecclesiæ Doctores subtilius annotarant. Hic componuntur, Sacrosancta Dei Oracula cum exterorum monumentis, Hebræorum Leges cum institutis Gentilium, Odæ Davidis, Solomonis Patemiæ, aliorumque Scriptorum θεοπνεύστων Gnômæ cum Ethnicorum Poetarum, Rhetorum, Philosophorum sententiis parallelis. Hic denique (quod optimum est interpretandi genus) videre est mirum SS. Codicum consensum concentumque, *alteriusque* ut *Alter poscit opem* locus, et *conjurat amicè*. Sed non opus est ut hederam hæc nostram prætexamus: Inspice Catalogum, et invenies Nomina omni lauro, omni laude majora. Quis singulorum fuerit Annotatorum scopus, quod consilium negotiumque, ex ipsorum, quas Catalogo subjunximus, Præfationibus constabit melius, optimè ex Opere. **ANNOTATIONES**, quæ in septem usque Tomos excreverunt, duobus insuper **TRACTATUUM** Tomis cumulantur: de quibus hoc tantum nos dixisse sufficiat. Hi etiam et ipsi *Annotationes* sunt, idque et *Criticæ*, et *Sacræ*, saltem dignissimi quæ Annotationibus ejusmodi quasi Appendix et *ἐπιμνηστικόν* adjiciantur. Jam quæ nostræ in hoc Opere partes fuerint restat ut exponamus: quod, ne te diutius molem paucis accipe. Hoc in primis tibi penitus persuasum iri cupimus, imò expectimus, et expectamus; Nos non cinnum hic commiscuisse, aut consarcinasse centonem, verum Auctores tibi exhibere integros et illibatos.* Adeo enim nobis penè religio fuit ipsos mutilare, ut etiam ubi alterius verba usurpat unus, et item alter, deinde tertius, atque ita ad eundem locum eadem non sensu tantum sed et verbis plures commentantur, nos eadem verba, licet aliquantulum gravatè, identidem reposuerimus, veriti scilicet, si ullibi vel superflua omissemus, nequis alibi et necessaria nos omisisse suspicaretur. Aliquid tamen juris nobismetipsis permisimus, idque e re tuâ, ut speramus, et cum bonâ vend. Nam non solum quam plurima quæ oscitabundi Typographi χυδόν et promiscuè ediderant, sed quædam etiam quæ Auctores ipsi in alieniorem locum rejecerant, nos opportuno et suo collocavimus. Sic quatuor illi Annotationum rivi quos tumultuario quodam impetu magnus ille eruditionis torrens JO. DRUSIUS in N. F. profudit, jam in unum alveum collecti leni cursu labuntur. Sic quæ H. GROTIUS ὁ πᾶν ad Decalogum, ad Ephes. 1.: ad 2 Thess. 2. 1. 12. ad Jac. 2. 14., &c. ad 1 Joh. 18—24. & 3. 9. & 4. 1—5. item ad Apoc. 13. & 17. fusiùs disseruit, et certas ob causas Annotatis ad Evangelia subiunxit, in hac nostrâ Editione proprias singula stationes obtinent. Ejusdem Viri Cl. Appendix ad interpretationem locorum N. T. quæ de Antichristo agunt aut agere putantur, Annotata ad Apoc. 17. immediatè subsequitur. Reliquorum quæ sparsim interseruimus sedes tibi indigebant Catalogi. Optima semper exemplaria secuti sumus; veruntamen ad errata ipsorum corrigenda, et supplendas lacunas, pèjora non raro nobis subsidio fuerunt. Quæ in Catalogo asteriscis præfixis insignantur, nunc primum in lucem prodeunt: reliqua antea excusa nos denovo tibi repræsentamus. Loca vel ex SS. Scripturis vel aliunde citata diligenter examinavimus, atq; inibiprehendimus multa mendarum millia, quas aut preli incuria fuderat, aut Scriptores, ut fit, nimium

properantes parum caverant. Omnia sumuâ quâ potuimus curâ recensuimus: Quæ in manifesto errore tenebantur; purgavimus; ubi res erat in dubio, conjecturis duntaxat * adhibitis, liberum tibi reliquimus iudicium. Characteres, quoties opus fuit, rite variavimus, et pravis interpunctionibus sublatis substituímus aptiores, atque ita locis obscuris et involutis eplhasin suam dedimus et perspicuitatem. Denique non pudet, inid juvat, meminisse quantum negotii nobis facerent minutia Typographica; quodque per integrum ferè sexennium literulis, numerorum notis, punctis, accentibus intenti fuserimus, et tantum non immersi. Hæc enim utcumque nugæ videantur, tamen *seria ducent in mala* ubi fuerint neglecta; et quicquid tuo commodò poterit inservire, nos nec nimis durum unquam iudicabimus, nec nobis indignum.—Vale; utere, fruire laboribus, eosque boni consule.

JO. PEARSON *Archidiaconus Suriensis.*

ANT. SCATTERGOOD *Ecclesiæ Lincolnensis
Canonicus.*

FRA. GOULDMAN *Ecclesiæ Okendon Australis
in Comitatu Esseriæ Rector.*

RIC. PEARSON *Coll. Reg. Socius.*

CORNELIUS BEE LECTORI.

Nequis nobis vel operis vel pretii magnitudinem objiciat, sciat ipsius et compendio commodò magnopere a nobis esse consultum. Hic enim libri circiter nonaginta, ique integri, in novem coierunt, et libræ plûs minis quinquagena (nuper vix aut ne vix minoris hæc omnia coemisses) jam ad quindenas rediguntur. Non est igitur quod de nobis justè queratur quispiam; est quod sibi et aliis plurimum gratuletur.

NO. XI.

In 1661, Dr. Pearson was appointed in his Majesty's Commission to bear a part in the debate at the Savoy, about the alteration of the Book of Common Prayer, &c.

NO. XII.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF
SOME EXPRESSIONS
IN
. SAINT ATHANASIUS
HIS
Creed :

For the satisfaction of those who think themselves thereby oblig'd to believe all things therein contain'd to be absolutely necessary to Salvation.

OXFORD,
Printed by Henry Hall, Printer to the University
for Tho. Robinson, 1663.

REMARKS

ON

DR. JOHNSON'S LATIN EPITAPH

ON MR. THRALF.

HAVING observed Dr. Johnson's Latin Epitaph on Mr. Thrale, published in your XVth No. p. 199, I am tempted to offer some remarks upon it, lest the general authority of his great name may mislead the young and inexperienced among your readers, in matters in which it is wholly undeserving of authority; his acquirements in what is called classical literature having been very limited and superficial; and when he undertook Latin composition, he was too proud to doubt, and too indolent to inquire; as this Epitaph abundantly proves.

In the first place, *seu*, occurring twice in line 3, is only employed by writers of good times as a connective of *alternatives* or *opposites*, never of *conjuncts*: it joins things, *one*, *not both*, of which we mean to state or affirm; so that the commendation of Mr. Thrale for *res seu domesticas seu civiles* can only belong to either *private*, or *public matters*, not to *both*, as intended.

The phrase too, *res civiles* or *domesticas agere*, must mean either to *agitate them*, as a disturber, or *exhibit them*, as an actor on the stage. To express the meaning intended, it should have been, in rebus *quum civilibus tum domesticis ita se gessit, ut*, &c. or in rebus *et civilibus et domesticis*, &c.

Multi, in line 4, is feeble and frigid. He might have written, without incurring the imputation of extravagant compliment, *qui noscerent omnes*.

Res sacras agere, (line 5.) is still more faulty than *res civiles* or *domesticas agere*; meaning, in its primary and obvious sense, to *agitate* or *move things forbidden*; and, if admissible at all in a sense like what is here intended, must mean to *perform the sacred functions* of a priest or minister of the church, *not merely to discharge punctually the ordinary moral duties of religion*.

Quam brevem (vitam) esset habiturus præsire, (line 6.) can only signify *prescience of the brevity of life prior to its commencement*: for *qui vitam habiturus est*, is *one who is to have life*, not *one who already has it*. It should have been, *quam brevis esset concessa sive videretur*; or more properly *ipse præsire videretur*: for such is the proper verb; and the addition of the emphatical pronoun would have given strength and spirit to the antithesis.

Sibique semper similis, (line 7.) is one of those quaint puerilities which so frequently disgrace the works of Ovid and Tasso. *Sibique semper æqualis* would have been enduring.

If by, *nihil ostentavit aut arte fictum aut cura elaboratum*, (lines 8—9.) be meant that *he ostentatiously displayed nothing skilfully contrived or carefully executed*, the expression is just and adequate: but if it be intended to signify that *he showed nothing artificial or affected in his manners*, it should have been, *nihil aut simulatum aut confictum ostendit*.

Regi patriæque fideliter studuit, (lines 10—11.) is, I believe, faulty; though, *regis dignitati, patriæque libertati, or prosperitati, fideliter studuit*, would have been proper.

The numeral *mille*, used indefinitely as in line 13, belongs, I believe, to light, loose, or comic modes of expression only, and seems noways adapted to the solemnity of a sepulchral inscription. Perhaps the writer's meaning had been properly and accurately expressed by, *inter assiduo ingruentia mercaturæ negotia*.

The word *nepotæ*, in line 30, is so employed, as to signify *the grandson of the person commemorated*, not *the person himself*, which the writer evidently intends. It should have been *cum eo*, instead of *cum nepote*.

In critical, philological, grammatical, or philosophical disquisitions I would by no means be a rigid exactor of purity, it not being in all cases possible to find ancient modes of diction adequate to modern modes of thought; and distinctness, perspicuity, and precision of sense, like Lord Bacon's, are cheaply obtained, even by all the barbarisms of his Latin, gross and manifold as they are: but in compositions which can pretend to no higher merits than those of expression, the expression should at least be faultless.

COLLATIO

CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674

CUM ODYSSEÆ EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

No. v.—Continued from No. XXII. p. 206.

386. αἰσί.

387. τὸ δὲ ἰλόττις ἀρισταρχος ἀντί τοῦ
ἔχοντις.

392. βάπτῃ.

393. σιδήσου γε.

395. ὠμώξιν et super *u* prius *α*.

404. νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην et supra γρ. δι' ὀφθαλίην.

405. μή τις σε.

406. κτίναι ex emend.

411. νοῦσον δ' et sic citat Schol. iastes supra ad 275, vbi etiam ἀλίμασθαι.

412. Post hunc additur in margine versus, τοῦ γὰρ δὴ παῖς ἴσσι· πατρὸς δι' οὗς εὐχεται εἶναι.

413. ἐγίλασι φίλον ἦτορ, sed γρ. κῆρ super ἦτορ.

428. τοῖς ἐπι.

444. ὕστατος δ' a m. secunda, sed antiqua.

445. λαχμῶ. Schol. γρ. καὶ λάχων παρωνυμῶς τῇ λάχνη.

451. γρ. ποθίως. sed potius credo referendum ad 453. vbi textus

πιθίως, v suprascripto a manu secunda, sed antiqua.

455. γρ. ἔμμεν' ἔλεθρον.

457. ὁ τ' ἐμ' (sic).

459. θεομετρῶν et supra glossa τυπτομένου, postea v finale textus in σ mutauit. Mox καδ' ἔμμεν' κῆρ, sed in marg. pro var. lect. καδδ' ἐμμεν'.

464. πῖονι et α super ι.

468. ἀνὰ δ' et supra ἐν.

477. σιγ' ἔμειλλε.

482. 539. νὸς a m. pr. et sic K. 127.

483. τυτθόν.

484. ἐκλεισθη, sed v super ιι.

485. τὴν δ' ὡψ οὕτως schol. marg.

489. κάπησον ἴν'.

491. ἀπῆραν. In marg. ῥίανος πλῆσσαντες:

499. οὐκρίεντι. Quæ vñrior est scriptura. MS. Hesychii, Μαριμάρον κριόντι, partim recte.

502. εἰ καὶ τις σε καταχοροῖαν citat Schol. supra ad 106.

504. πολίκορβοι, sed vulgatum 530.

516. ἀλάωσι, sed ας super εν et pro interpretatione, ἐνύφλωσας ἡμα-

ταίωσας. Deinde ἰδαμάσατο et supra, σσας

520. αἰκε ἔλκη.

523. ψυχῆς γι et τι supra γκ.

528. κλύθι.

533. ἦν nunc, sed ε erasum.

539. προπαρόειθε et supra γρ. μετ-όπισθι.

540. 542. ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου ἀθετεῖται. πῶς γὰρ ἐμαλιν ἠνεχθη:

553. ἔκαιον ὀδ' et ηα super αιον. Post ὀδ' additum ἀρ' m. antiqua. Legi igitur voluit emendator, μερὶ' ἔκη, ὁ δ' ἄρ' οὐκ ι. ι.

554. ἀλλ' ὄγα μεμερίζειν et ζ in ξ mutatum. In marg. γρ. ἀλλ' ἄρα

559. δὴ τότε κ. et sic K. 186.

561. ἱποτρύνας et αν super ας.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Κ.

6. νῆες a m. pr. ἡβάντες.

7. ἀποις a m. pr. ι in α mutauit manus recentior.

11. αἰδοίης.

12. τηρτοῖσι λήχισσι. Schol. marg. τηρτοῖσι.

13. γρ. καὶ ταίχια μακρά.

16. καὶ μίν. Mox κατὰλεξω, sed ι super α secundum, et α super ω.

19. δῶκε δέ μοι ἰνδρίας.

30. ἰόντας et ις super ας ab eadem manu. Schol. marg. ἰόντες ἡμεῖς.

31. ἐπύλλαβε.

39. γρ. καὶ δώμαθ' ἔκτα..

41. ζηρόδοτος ἐκτιλίοντες.

42. οἰκαδ' ἐπιστόμειδα.

43. ταδ' ἔδωκε in text. In marg. ταδ' ἔδωκεν: οὕτως ἀρίσταρχος. ἄλλοι δὲ τὰ δίδωκε καὶ τὰ γ' ἔδωκε καὶ τὰ γι

δάκρυον ἠρωδιανόν.

58. σίτοι τ' ἐπιστάμεν'.

62. ἰλόντες δ' ἀνιδρύματ' ἐπισταθμῶ-
σιν. γε. πρὸς δώμα παρὰ σταθμοῖσιν.

65. Videtur a m. pr. fuisse ὄφρ'
δὲ ἵκηαι.

70. κακοῖσι, sed linea transversa
damnatum, et suprasc. μαλακοῖσι.
[Nisi merus est error, volebat
καλοῖσι.] In marg. ξηρότοτος μαλ-
ακοῖσιν ἀμειβόμενος γράφει.

75. ἔρ' ἐπὶ ἀθανάτοισιν.

93. κύματ'. Primo fuit γ' pro
τ', sed nihil in accentibus mutavit.
Quod si alterum consilio scripsis-
set, ita notasset, κύμα γ'. Apolloni-
us v. ἀέξιο habet κύματ'.

100. πρόξιν.

103. γε. ἦ καὶ ἄμαξαι.

106. θυγάτηρ (sic).

107. κατεβήσαστο.

110. τῶνδ' text. et schol. τὰ δὲ

οἷσιν ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τοῦ τ'.

116. δῖπτον et supra γε. δόρπον.

118. τεύχεα et, χε supra ξαι.

123. ἀνδρῶν τ'.

124. πίνοντο text. In schol. πίν-
οντο ἀρίσταρχος φέροντο. Paulo ante
Schol. ἀριστοφάνης ἰχθύς δὲ ὡς εἴροντες.

126. ἐγὼν ἄρα.

129. φύγωμεν.

130. οἶδ' ἄμα: τοῦτο μὲν ἐμφαντι-
κόν. ἔνιοι δὲ γε. οἶδ' ἄρα πάντες. καλ-
λίστρατος δὲ καὶ ῥιανὸς διὰ τοῦ λ. οἶδ'
ἄρα πάντες;—[Maffus librarii in vlti-
mis aberravit; volebat οἶδ' ἄλλα
πάντες, quod etiam coniecit Tou-
pius Cur. Nou. in Suid. v. ἀνέριψαν.
Suidas quidem et Apollonius ha-
bent ἄμα, sed ἄλλα fortiter defen-
dunt loca a Toupio laudata, supra
H. 328, infra N. 78.]

136. ἀριστοφάνης οὐδήσας,

140. ἦα.

146. παρὰ et ἀπὸ suprascr.

152. ὅπποι et suprascr. γε. καππῶν.

156. νῆας.

160. ξηρότοτος δὲν γὰρ μη.

164. γε. διὰ τοῦ μ. ἐκπείσας. ἱπ-
πας· πλησίονας ὡς τὸ λαξ ἐν στήθεσσι
βῆς:

166. εἴας.

169. καταποφάδια schol. marg.

170. οὐπας ἦν: ἀριστοφάνης δὲ οὐ-
πας εἶχεν.

174. οὐ γὰρ πω καταδυστέμεν, sed
σ supra ω additum.

175. ἐπὶ λθι. text. ἐπὶ λθῖν schol.

178. ἢ τισι τὸ οὕτως φέρεται: —
(pro ὅκα).

188. ῥιανὸς δὲ τότε ἔγαν ἁ. θ. μετὰ
μῦθοι ἔειπον:

220. ἀρίσταρχος γε. ἔσταν δ' ἐν πρε-
θύροισιν:

224. πολίτης (Πολίτης est error
typorum).

Inter 233. et 234. additur in

marg. β. τυῦχιν· δὲ κυκίῳ χρυσίῳ
δίπται ὄφρα πῆμιν.

239. 240. τρεῖς καὶ δέμας.
Schol. ξηρότοτος καὶ πόδας γε. καὶ ἐν
ἄλλῳ φωνήν τι τρεῖς καὶ δέμας:

242. παρ' ἀκυλον. In schol.
παρ' ἀκυλον: ἀρίσταρχος οὐκ οἶδε τὰς
στιχοι. ἐδὲ καλλίστρατος ἀντ' αὐτοῦ γε.
παντός μὲ ὕλης ἰτίθι μελιηδία καρπὸν.

249. ἀγαζόμεν'. In marg. ἐν
ἄλλῳ ἀγαζόμενα.

253. omittit, et mox 265.

268. ἄξις et ῥ super ἄ. In marg.
ἀρίσταρχος ἀντ' τοῦ σῶν: (Ita nempe
explicat σῶν.)

281. πῇ δ' αὐτ' ὦ δύστην.

285. σύ γ'.

287. δ' omittit.

288. ἀλύκῃσι.

296. κελύσται et x additum su-
per: prius. In schol. κελύσται.

306. ἴσασιν. et supra γε. δύνα-
ται.

316. τυῦχι. Deinde δίπται et in
marg. ἐν ἄλλῳ. γηράϊ ὑπὸ λιπαρῶς:

[lege in ἄλλω, δίπα', ὡς γήρα' ὑπὸ λ.]

320 λίζο et in marg. οὕτως αρι-
σταρχος δισυλλαβας το λίζο. ἀδελον δι
πότιρον κοιμῶ ἢ συναριθμῶ: [Legi
συναριθμῶ. Videntur quidam le-
gisse λίζε' elisum pro λίζο, quod
plenum exstat Il. I. 639. Postea
ε λίζε, nota elisionis neglecta, fac-

tum est λίζαι.]

324. καί μ' ὀλοφύρομενη: ἀριστοφ-
άνη. καί μ' λισσομένη καί ἔστιν εὐπ-
άχαρις ἡ γραφή.

326. ὡς οὕτ' et πῶς super ὡς.

329. ὁ σιδώνιος φησιν ἀδιδύσθαι τοῖς
στίχοις.

334. ἐπιβήσαν.

REMARKS ON LATIN METRE,

More particularly of a short vowel being lengthened when followed by the consonants sp—sc—st—and sm.

THE true method of ascertaining the force of the consonants above mentioned is certainly taken in the first No of the *Classical Journal*, where the authorities for and against the observance of it are laid before us. A writer on Latin Metre, in the third No of your Journal, under the signature of L. makes several assertions on the subject, in few of which I can acquiesce, and to which I shall take the liberty of replying in the present Essay. That the metrical canon advanced by Terentianus Maurus, and supported by DAVIS, is in general acknowledged by the classical scholars of the present day, I by no means admit; the weight of authorities on the question will be adverted to in another part of this Essay.—From the manner in which L. writes, I do not believe him to be an Etonian; yet as he adopts the metrical canons which the gentlemen of Eton maintain, in answering him I shall take the liberty of controverting the three metrical canons of that school, which are the following.

First, that a short final vowel is lengthened when followed by the consonant *sp—&c.*

Secondly, that such words as *servitu, officiu, consiliu, imperu*, are not to be admitted in the genitive case as words of four syllables.

Thirdly, that the letter O is not a short vowel, nor admissible in Latin verses as short, when scanned with another short vowel, for example, *tendo chelyn, caligō futuri, farragō libelli, præponō Sāburra*, instances of which occur in every page of Statius, Juvenal, and Martial.

The gentlemen of Eton are excellent Latin scholars, and happily cultivate the Latian Muse. Being learned, they are also liberal, and will hear with candor objections to their system. I propose to consider the metrical canons in the order I have stated them. I begin with the first of them, of short vowels being lengthened when followed by the consonants *sp—&c.*

Some among the Greeks have accounted the letter S merely an aspiration, in which number is Plato. Many of the learned

among them avoided the frequent use of it. The Romans, following the example of their masters, softened this letter down to a mere aspiration. The comic poets write *audin'*, *credin'*, instead of *audisne*, *credisne*. The other old Latin poets in many instances consider it as a mere aspiration before a short syllable, and even before a long; witness the following sort of verses, which occur in every page of Lucretius:

Nam si de nihilo fierent ex omnibus rebus. l. 1.

Nam fierent juvenes subito ex infantibus parvis. ib.

Sive foras fertur non est ea finis profecto. ib.

Scire licet gigni posse ex non sensibus sensus. l. 2.

In this last quoted verse *S* is made both an aspiration and a letter; and many similar instances can be produced. I contend therefore from the preceding premises, that *S* was considered anciently by the Romans as either an aspiration, or a letter, as it suited a poet's convenience. I admit that the writers of the Augustan age, in general, but not always, abstained from making it a mere aspiration, probably from some change which had taken place in the pronunciation of the language. Your correspondent L. has the following words: "It is a curious thing that, in an author who pretends to treat of the art of Poetry, there should be two false quantities in two consecutive syllables—

Convulsuni remis rostrisque stridentibus æquor.

Those who would read *tridentibus* to favor Vida would act as Nero to Lucan, *beneficio Neronis fama servata*, they would give him his death blow. This is not a line of Vida's, it is a line from Virgil, to be found *Æn.* 5. v. 143, and again in *Æn.* 8. v. 690. It is so given in all the old editions of Virgil. the modern indeed have *tridentibus*. I have a quarto edition of Virgil now before me, printed at Paris in the year 1520, which gives the line in both places with the word *tridentibus*. Vida merely quotes the line as he found it in his own Virgil, deeming it a line suiting the subject of his Poetics. The Editor of the Variorum Virgil says that the first syllable in *stridens* being looked upon as long by grammarians, this verse has much puzzled them, and they have endeavoured to substitute in its place *sonantibus*, *ruentibus*, and *tridentibus*, and then adds, "sed lectiones hujusmodi in nullo ex antiquis exemplaribus offendi, quum vero bona codicum antiquiorum pars rostrisque stridentibus habeat." This Editor says that *rostrisque stridentibus* is merely a conjectural reading from the University of Naples, in which, however, (though he thinks *stridentibus* may be well supported) he acquiesces, because in some ancient pictures, and coins, prows of Roman vessels with three projections, somewhat like a Trident, may be observed. Although your correspondent L. styles this line a puerility of Vida, yet most judges, I believe, will admit it to be a very forcible line, and strongly expressive of a vessel dashing through the water with great violence.

That Virgil himself deemed it such is apparent from his repeating it a second time, a practice, though Homeric, by no means common with him. I think there are sundry objections to *tridentibus*. We cannot imagine that Virgil, describing a vessel rushing with great rapidity through the water, would stop to mention the shape of the prow. Besides *rostris* properly requires the union of an adjective, *tridentibus* is a substantive. L. himself strongly objects to *tridentibus*, but now, when he discovers it to be a Virgilian verse, it is incumbent on him to remove the difficulty, and inform us how the line is to be read. The difficulty in the case is, that the first syllable is in no other place found short, but, for what we know to the contrary, it may have been common. Perhaps Virgil, thinking the word strong and expressive, might, like Lucretius and the old Latin writers, deem the *S* at the beginning of it, a mere aspiration, and in this instance think proper to adopt the ancient custom. This is not the only instance of a Virgilian line where *S* is cut off in the manner of Lucretius :

Limina tectorum et mediis in penetralibus hostem.

This reading Pierius, Farnaby, and others insist, is the true one. There are many reasons to support *stridentibus*. All good manuscripts concur in it.—The word is repeated a second time with the same concurrence.—There is no substitute given for it except from mere conjecture.—The verse expresses forcibly the sense which Virgil meant to convey to his readers—Strong manuscript authority is not to be laid aside from conjecture. I may at all events, however, here take notice, that whatever may be thought of the preceding observations, the question in dispute by no means depends upon the verses mentioned: the cause I support can be fully maintained without them. There seems no pretence to say that a short vowel before any two other consonants, except those beginning with *sp*, &c. is made long in Latin verse by such position, so that at all events if there be such a metrical rule, it is contrary to analogy, and to the general practice of the Roman writers, and therefore requires strong evidence to support it.

The pronunciation of the Latin language is entirely lost; if we merely consult our ears, these consonants *sp*—&c. no more offend us than any two other consonants, for instance the following verse :

Nos pavidī trepidare metu, crinemque flagrantem

Excutere—

In the word *flagrans* there are six consonants, and only two vowels, yet no one pretends to say that his ear is offended by the first syllable of the word being short. Virgil in another place makes *flagrans* long—*Flagrantes perfusa genas*. This subject therefore can only be determined by attending to the practice of the Roman

* See also Æneid, XII. 709. where *decernere* is the old and general reading. Ed.

writers. In the first Number of your Journal, you give us this practice, by which let the matter be determined.

Strong symptoms of a bad cause appear, when it cannot be maintained without the destruction of all authorities hitherto deemed incontrovertible; and when this destruction is to be accomplished, not by argument, but by an ipse dixit. These levellers of authorities are not unlike those of the present day, who style themselves Christians, yet deny the validity of those parts of the Scriptures which militate against their tenets and doctrines, and scruple not to strike them out of their Bibles. L. says that the only authorities with regard to Latin metre, are the Odes of Horace, Virgil, and Catullus. So that the greater part of Horace, all Ovid, Lucretius, Propertius, Tibullus, and all the later writers, with one fell swoop are put *hors de combat*. I cannot submit to this short method of deciding the question, but shall now take the liberty of making some observations on the authorities mentioned in your Journal.

The old Latin writers had no notion of any such metrical canon. There appear ten examples in Lucretius of the nonobservance of it, and none for it.

Propertius too is entirely against it.

In Virgil there are three against it, and one of very doubtful authority for it.

In Ovid there are nineteen against it, and not one for it. I am aware that some of the examples against it in Ovid are attempted to be invalidated by various readings, but to this I shall presently reply.

As to Catullus, the great authority with L., he may fairly be put out of the question, he cannot prejudice our cause. This author being a great admirer of the Grecian writers, and his best poems being probably translations from them, followed the Grecian rule of making a short syllable long before any two consonants. But that rule is not countenanced by any other Roman writer, yet Catullus has the following line:

Testis erit magnis virtutibus unda Scamandri.

So that, as your excellent correspondent in your 19th No. (p. 122,) observes, "if this line is the only instance in which Catullus has not lengthened a final vowel before any two consonants whatever, instead of asserting that he attributed a peculiar power to *sc*, *sp*, or *st*, we ought to conclude that *sc* was weaker than any other combination."

Let us now see what can be urged against the overwhelming authority in opposition to the rule.

Lucretius and Propertius are not writers of the Augustan age, they are too ancient; at all events they show the ancient practice. They clearly prove the rule (if any such there be) to be

an innovation. The chief reliance of those who support the canon appears to be on one single line of Virgil, of very doubtful authority.

Ferte citi flammam, date tela, scandite muros.

Erythræus, in his learned index to Virgil, though he is a great advocate for the verse as here quoted, acknowledges that all ancient copies are against it; that Macrobius and other grammarians read *et scandite*; that Servius adopts it without the least observation or objection; that Pontanus so read it. I may add that Vida must have so found it in his Virgil, from the manner in which he quotes it in his Poetics. The Variorum editor, compelled by manuscript authority, gives *et*, as also the Parisian edition before mentioned by me, printed in the year 1520. Is it sufficient against all this to say, that to the moderns the *et* appears to incumber the verse, and to destroy its effect? At all events Virgil has only one verse for the rule, and three against it.

Your correspondent L. endeavours to impeach the authority of Horace, as to metre, by saying, as many others have said before him, that his hexameter verses are not to be concluded as unimpeachable, being *sermoni propiores*. But *sermoni propior*, in the original, merely refers to the subject of his verses, and not to the verses themselves. He merely says that his subjects are prosaic, and consequently his lines must be destitute of poetic fire; but we are not to conclude from this that he disregarded metre. This is a most absurd supposition. If the case were so, his compositions would be the strangest jumble of inconsistencies that were ever submitted to the world, half verse, half prose. L. ought to produce instances of this neglect of metre, and show that there is somewhat in Horace that cannot be justified by the example of other poets: but this he has not done, nor can do. L. deals more in assertion than any writer I ever read. Poor Ovid, like the rest of his poetical brethren, is attacked in the same mode. L. says, "Ovid utterly disregarded the wholesome severity of metrical jurisprudence:" but this is absolutely contrary to fact. Perhaps L. does not know that Ovid, so far from disregarding metrical rules, apologizes in one of his epistles, de Pont., to a very great friend whom he had known from infancy, for not writing to him, and showing him some mark of his remembrance, because his name, Tuticanus, was inadmissible in verse. It will not be irrelevant to our subject to insert a part of it.

Tuticano.

Quo minus in nostris ponais, amice, libellis,
Nominis efficitur condicione tui.

Ast ego non alium prius hoc dignarer honore,
Est aliquod nostrum si modo carmen honos

Lex pedis officio, naturaque nominis obstant,
 Quaque meos, adeas est via nulla motioa.
 Nam pudet in geminos ita nomen scindere versus
 Desinat ut prior hoc, incipiatque minor.
 Et pudeat, si te, qua syllaba prima moratur,
 Arctius appellem, Tuticanumque vocem.
 Non potis in versum Tuticani more venire,
 Fiat ut e longa syllaba prima brevis.
 Aut producatür quæ nunc correptius exit,
 Et sit porrecta longa secunda mora,
 His ego si vitis ausim corrumpere nomen,
 Rideat, et merito pectus habere neger.

It appears from this epistle, that Ovid held metre almost sacred, and thought that nothing could justify a poet in deviating from it.

It may, perhaps, be alleged that some of the authorities against the rule produced from Ovid may be objected to, on the ground of various readings; but at all events many of them must be established. It very clearly appears that some copyer, some librarian, a disciple of Terentianus Maurus, has been tampering with this poet. Who can doubt the authenticity of the following line?

Ante meos oculos tua stat, tua semper imago est.

The alteration made is, *visa est*, instead of *tua stat*. But how flat is this! How violent the alteration! I will mention another line.

Illa sonat raucum, quiddamque inamabile stridet.

Ridet is the various reading; but this is not only contradicted by the best manuscripts, but most incontrovertibly by the context. The line which follows *inamabile stridet*, is,

Ut rudit a scabra turpis asella mola.

Let us examine some other lines:

— nostri litera scripta memor.

Ista Mycenæa litera scripta manu.

Scripta, according to the various readings in both instances, is changed into *facta*, but this is done with every appearance of force and impropriety. There is, however, in Ovid de Trist. l. 5, El. 12, a line to the same purport, to which there appears no various reading,

Carmina scripta mihi sunt nulla, aut qualia cernis.

If *scripta* must stand good in this place, why not in the others? In the following line,

Oraque fontana fevida spargit aqua.

The various reading is, *pulsat aqua*, which appears scarcely intelligible: *spargit aqua* is the common phrase of Ovid. Upon the whole, if any one will attentively consider the various readings, and at the same time consult the text, he will be convinced that few or none of them can stand their ground, and that, upon the whole, Ovid must be considered as a most powerful, incontrovertible, and

decided authority against the rule; and if its advocates have nothing to advance, but merely a gratis dictum that the best versifier in the Latin language did not observe, or regard the laws of metre, their cause is in a desperate situation. If the authority of any ancient poet can with reason be objected to, it is that of Virgil, who left his great work imperfect; so much so, in his own opinion, that he requested it to be destroyed. Ovid, on the contrary, is so confident of the excellence of his great work, that he defies even Jove himself to destroy it. Ovid, in my humble opinion, is a better versifier than Virgil; I do not say poet; his verses abound much less in elisions. I never can think that elisions add to the harmony of verse. Ovid, though well acquainted with Virgilian verse, never chose to imitate it. There are several lines in Virgil, for the metre of which grammarians do not satisfactorily account, such as the following:

Posthabita coluisse Samo, hic illius arma.
 Et succus pecori et lac subducitur agnis.
 Et vera incessu patuit Dea; ille ubi matrem.
 Stant et juniperi et castaneæ hirsutæ.
 Clamassent et littus Hila, Hila omne sonaret.
 Nomen et arma locum servant, te, amice nequivi.
 Credimus? an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt.
 Rumpere moras omnes turbataque arripe castra.

Are these mistakes, or only defensible licences? No modern, I am sure, would venture to copy them. There are, however, other lines seemingly contrary to the laws of prosody, which can now be well accounted for, on the ground of Professor Dunbar's learned, ingenious, and satisfactory discovery of the principle of Homeric versification, which is equally applicable to Latin hexameters, and was certainly adopted from Homer, by Virgil and other Latin writers. The principle is, that a syllable naturally short may be made long by being the first syllable of a foot, the arsis, or metrical ictus, or cæsural syllable, call it which you please, resting upon it. All the Virgilian lines ending in *or*, *it*, *bus*, or any other consonant which would be naturally short before a vowel, may thus be lengthened; and even a short vowel may be lengthened. We shall have no difficulty, in future, in accounting for such licences as the following: *Omnia vincit amor et nos; Gravidus autimnus; Pectoribus inhians; Caput Evandrius abstulit ensis; Canit Hymenæos; Fultus Hyacintho; Auro gravia sectoque Elephanto; Liminaque laurusque; Ensemque clypeumque; Pontesque fluviisque, &c. &c.* Of such lines I should not think there were fewer than fifty in Virgil. I do not here mean to say that the force of the cæsural syllable in Latin verse is now first discovered; but that there was always an outcry against any modern who laid claim to the licence; false quantity! false quantity! was echoed from all

quarters, and this metrical license was always received with coldness, and a timid, half kind of assent. But as it is now shown that Homeric versification is founded on this principle, which Virgil and others adopted, the practice will henceforward rest on a firm foundation. This I am happy to say is a rule of liberty, not of restriction, such as I am now combating: but I must confess that restriction appears to be the order of the day. Although on this occasion I earnestly declare for this liberty of the cæsural syllable, I admit it to be contrary to the general laws of Latin prosody, and that it ought to be used with moderation and discretion.

I must now add a few words on Catullus. As to the opinion of L. that we are to look up to this writer as a principal authority in metre, I fancy that very few will be disposed to coincide in it. Catullus laid down a rule to himself, as has been before observed, to which no other Roman poet ever paid the least attention, but contradicted in every ten lines. His pentameter verses offend against every rule regarded by other elegiac poets. Take a specimen of them:

Troja virūm et virtutum omnium acerba cinis.

Illam affligit odore, iste perit podagra.

Aut facere hæc a te dictaque factaque sunt.

There ought, at least, to be a pause at the end of every pentameter verse; the sense ought not to run into the ensuing hexameter, according to the Grecian mode. To this Catullus pays no regard.

Nunquam ego te, vitæ frater amabilior

Aspiciam?

Quo mea se molli candida Diva pede

Intulit?

The polysyllabic terminations of the Greek pentameter are hardly tolerable in Latin, and have been studiously avoided by Ovid and Tibullus, whereas the terminations of the pentameters of Catullus are in general of this sort.

Catullus makes the first syllable in *juverint* short, an instance of which can be found in no other writer.

* Non, ita me Divi, vera gemunt, jūverint. Poem. 64. v. 18.

His short poems in hexameter and pentameter verse have little merit, and are in general on offensive subjects. So that in every point of view I think Catullus must be objected to as authority.

Having, I trust, shown that the great classical poets disregarded the alleged metrical canon, let us examine the authority on which it at present rests.

The old grammarians differ so much from one another on the subject, as has been shown by your correspondent in your 19th No., that nothing to be depended on can be elicited from them. The

great Terentianus Maurus then is to determine the question. But who is Terentianus Maurus? In what age did he live? I can find no account of him in Bayle, or Sir Th. Blount. Until this point is settled, he is no authority whatever. On consulting Harwood, I am informed that the first edition of his work appeared in the year 1497. Probably he is not more ancient than the date of his work, and is to be classed among those writers, who, on the revival of letters in the 15th century, when manuscripts of ancient writers were in high request, endeavoured to palm himself on the world in the light of an ancient. I think it incumbent on his patrons to give us some reason for their veneration of him. I have not this writer at present by me, but I take his position from the verses as quoted by your correspondent in the 19th No. of your Journal. The meaning of his verses appears to me obscure and contradictory. I am, however, content, that his patrons should elicit that metrical rule from him, which has hitherto been the subject of this essay. In the first place, then, he lays down a rule which the writings of the ancients almost entirely contradict, and to support which no sufficient instances can be produced. Secondly, in the short quotation from him in your Journal, he manifestly shows himself ignorant in a matter in which a writer on metre ought to be particularly conversant: he says, that Virgil makes a false quantity when he writes, *solus hic inflexit sensus*. But this is not the only place in which Virgil makes *hic* short before a vowel. He begins a very memorable line thus—*Hic vir, hic est*, &c. I believe, there is no doubt that other writers make *hic* short. Terentianus Maurus says that the line in Virgil, *Insula Ionio in magno*, &c. is a false quantity; to other critics of great name the verse appears defensible. These instances are sufficient to show that Terentianus Maurus is not infallible in all his positions. Other objections might be made, without doubt, to his doctrines, if any one thought it worth while to scrutinise them. Dawes supports the doctrine of Terentianus Maurus: Dawes was undoubtedly a very learned man, and, as a Grecian, of Porsonian stature, but as a Latin scholar, he can claim no pre-eminence over others. It must be admitted that he was very positive, and very dogmatical, no very excellent qualities in a critic. However, *valdeat ejus auctoritas quantum valere potest*. Bentley and Tyrwhitt knew of no such doctrine. Dr. Symmons, in his defence of Milton's Latin poetry, (that such poetry should be defamed! that men of learning should think it necessary to come forward against his pigmy critics!) intimates to us, that the learned Dr. Parr, a friend of liberty and the Muses, supports the Dawesian system. But it is no great symptom of his regard for it, that he furnishes his friend with instances against it. I shall not, however, give in-

PLICIT credit to this information, until I see it confirmed under his hand. I should like very much to see the subject of Latin metre discussed by Dr. Parr; I wish some potent voice could rouse this venerable and recumbent lion, this sovereign of the forest, from his den.

The men of Eton certainly defend one of their own canons, and I do not hesitate to acknowledge the weight due to them. But the men of Westminster and Winchester not only deny this, but the two other Etonian canons, as their poetical compositions sufficiently testify. I believe few impartial men will admit that either of these schools should concede the palm to Eton. The editors of the Portroyal Latin Grammar, most pre-eminent scholars, deny any kind of authority to this *sp.* rule. All the Italian, German, Dutch, and English writers of Latin verse, treat it with contempt. To say all that need be said, in one word—the two first seats of learning and the Muses which the world can boast, the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, pay no regard to any of the metrical canons which I controvert. They both annually give premiums to those who excel in Latin poetry, and reject no man's verses for non-adherence to them, as is sufficiently apparent from the prize poems published at both the Universities.

I come now to the second canon, that such words as *servitii*, *consilii*, *officii*, *imperii*, *navigii*, are not to be admitted in the genitive case as words of four syllables. I do not know whether the supporters of this canon admit words of the nominative case ending in *i* to be of four syllables, but I take for granted that they do not. It is very difficult to know what to say on the subject, because no one of the supporters of this extraordinary metrical canon has condescended to inform us on what ground it is founded. I know of no Roman writers who observe it. L., in his dictatorial manner, says words of this kind can only be allowed in a pentameter verse. But why so? I could fill pages with instances where they are used in hexameters. Ovid, the best of all authorities, introduces them in all parts of his numerous works. It is needless to make collections of them from him, and other writers. I shall quote two or three lines from memory.

Hosne mihi fructus, hunc fertilitatis honorem

Officique refert? —————

Nullum *servitii* signum cervice gerentem.

I recollect a line of this sort of five syllables—

Arte supercilii confinia nuda repletis.

Horace has — *Mæonii* carminis alite.

Virgil has — *Narycii* posuerunt mœnia Locri.

These instances occur to me whilst writing, I do not think it necessary to add more, until I learn the ground on which the canon is founded. Horace, certainly, in his lyrical compositions, contracts

several words of this stamp. as *imperii*, *consili*, *Pompili*, *Tarquini*. The license is here in the contraction, making a word properly of four syllables, only of three. Why Horace does so, is obvious. Words so contracted are more suitable to lyrical compositions; unless so contracted they could not find a place in Iambics, but if so contracted, they could not be used in hexameters. These words are by poets made suitable to the different metres in which they write. There are, however, many of this sort of words, of the contraction of which no instances can be produced. I never heard of *offici*, *navigi*. I doubt whether the supporters of the system would contract words for which they could produce no authority. It has been said, that there can no instance be produced of classical authority making *imperii* of four syllables. I have lately been reading Juvenal, and can assert, that it is to be found three times in his Satires. Ovid, I recollect, has this line—

Non sunt imperii tui fera iussa mei.

But all words of this kind stand upon the same footing, and though any particular word might not be found in a classical author, it would not follow from thence, that it was not authorised, because four syllables are the legitimate number, and the admission of only three is the license. Upon the same ground that you object to making *imperii* of four syllables, it appears to me that you might object to such words as *fluxii*, *gladii*, *radii*, being three. The loss of such a large class of words in hexameters as those in question would occasion many unnecessary difficulties. I think I may now dismiss this canon.

Let us now come to the third, that the letter *o* ought not to be used as a short vowel, when scanned with another short vowel. For instance, *tendō chelyn*, *caligō futuri*, *farragō libelli*, &c.

It cannot be denied, that words ending in *o* are made short by, all Romans where *o* concludes the foot—*nunc scio*, *nunc volo*, *at vult*, *sentio*, *nescio*, &c. &c. Your correspondent, in the 19th No. of your Journal, furnishes me with one line from Ovid, which contradicts the canon.

Ingenio formæ damna rependo meæ.

I have looked for ten minutes into Ovid, and find, in one of his most finished poems, that, de arte Am., the following verses:

Adjice præceptis hoc quoque, Naso,* tuis.

Pollicitisque favens vulgus adesto meis.

—Naso magister erāt.

Collige, vel digitis en ego tollo meis.

Horace has—*Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.*

There cannot be the least doubt that *o* is common; but I admit

* No one doubts that *o* is common in Nominatives, and of course in Vocatives. EDIT.

that Virgil and Ovid rarely made it short in the manner mentioned in the above canon; although the later poets did, but I contend, nevertheless, that this is no reason for the moderns to abstain from the practice in question.

It is well known that not only language, but the pronunciation of it, alters in the course of time. No language altered more rapidly than the Latin. It is clear, that the pronunciation of it changed very much from the time of Lucretius to that of Virgil. The letter *s* gave no offence to Lucretius, whereas it has been observed that Virgil avoided ending a word with this letter, and beginning the following with the same. Each particular poet has his peculiar fancy and caprice in the construction of his verse, as observed in those of Catullus, Virgil, and Martial. All poets, in all ages, have had peculiarities of this sort. But their contemporaries or successors are not bound to follow the caprices, even of the best poets. That the observance of seldom making the *o* short by Virgil in the manner mentioned in the rule, arose probably from some singularity of opinion, or from the pronunciation of the day, is manifest from the total rejection of it by succeeding poets. Ovid, too, an Augustan writer, shows by his own practice its admissibility. Statius, Juvenal, and Martial, make *o* short in every page; they were all as well acquainted with the writings of Virgil as we are, admired him as much, knew his practice as well, yet even his example and authority had no influence on them. Juvenal idolised Virgil, he refers frequently to him in his Satires.—He thus compliments him:

Conditor Iliados cantabitur, atque Maronis

Altisoni dubiam facientia carmina palmam. Sat. xi.

People are often induced by fashion, or by admiration of a person, to imitate that for which there is no substantial reason. But no motive of this kind operated on any of the later writers. I conclude, from the whole, that Virgil was merely guided by his ear, and the pronunciation of his time, in this matter. But as the pronunciation of Latin is lost, and must have been different at different periods, I contend that the moderns have nothing to do with niceties of this sort, and that, in the present instance, they are at full liberty to follow the example of the later poets, especially in a practice which no age forbade. One of the Latin Fathers asserts, that if the word *primus*, in the first line of Virgil's *Æneid*, had ended in *is*, (suppose the word *tristis*) it would have offended the ears of the old Romans; but if this assertion be well founded, which I much doubt, I know not what metrical rule is to be drawn from it. We can merely say it is a nicety of which the moderns have no notion.

I admit, as a good metrical rule, that enclitics should be joined

to the first word of a clause, but even this rule is very frequently offended against by Ovid and Tibullus in pentameter verses.

— jactatas excutiatque faces. Ovid de gr. Aman. l. 1

— in medios desiluitque rogos. l. 1.

— tam sero cur veniatque rogat. l. 1,

Cura fugit, multo diluiturque mero. l. 1.

Upon the whole, I think it unwise in the moderns to throw stumbling-blocks in the way of Latin composition, to lay down metrical laws which are very disputable. The old Romans will not rise from their graves to condemn us—the moderns must be content to be ignorant of Roman pronunciation. I must, for my own part, declare that I detest those minute, captious, illiberal, word-catching critics, who are never pleased but when they can find fault. If the Latin verses of a modern are written in the true spirit of poetry, be harmonious, not too much encumbered with spondees and elisions, and the latinity of them be good, they must give pleasure to every classical reader, notwithstanding any trifling metrical lapse. The critics of the present times appear to read modern Latin poetry, not with any view to be pleased, but merely to discover some lapse. L. mentions some excellent Latin poet, and learned man, who made *u* in *salubris* short; this, in the opinion of L., counterbalances all excellencies, and condemns the poet for ever. Terentianus Maurus maintains that Virgil has made false quantities, and every poet who ever wrote has committed many and great errors. I require verses to be read with a liberal spirit; give due commendation to good verses; gently hint any lapse which may appear; do not expect perfection; nothing is more easily rectified than an error in metre; a man who has a facility in making Latin verses, can turn a sentence twenty different ways. I shall only add, that writing Latin verses must be deemed a liberal entertainment either in young or old, at least by those who read the Classical Journal, or write in it. It would be a matter to be lamented, that a person who can write such excellent Latin verses as Mr. Lonsdale, an Etonian, and many others, whose poems appear in your Journals, should not continue the practice in more advanced life, for really our present English poets are not intitled to very high praise. The Hobgoblin, and the cloud-capt, Indo-mythological, poets of these days are above the reach of classical readers, they are intelligible only to the female part of the world.

ANTI-MAURUS.

NOTICE OF

A GRAMMAR of the GREEK TONGUE, on a new plan.
By JOHN JONES, 3d Edition, 1815, 12mo.

THIS philosophical, and yet sufficiently practical, Grammar, is now presented to the Public in a more acceptable form, and the improvements which it has undergone in this, the third edition cannot be better stated than in Mr. Jones's own words:—

“Much remote, and less practical, matter, has been excluded and the volume is solely occupied in detailing the parts of speech, and the rules of syntax. The formation of the moods and tenses, a subject so complicated in this tongue, is given at great length; and the fulness of the detail, though it may appear formidable, instead of incumbering, will be found to aid the memory. The difficulty attending verbs in μ is universally felt by learners. The manner of treating that branch of the Greek verb is peculiar to this Grammar. The expediency of resolving the *four* classes into *one* common model, of reducing the tenses into *two*, *present* and *past*, and of deriving so great a variety of terminations from a few invariable rules of contraction, will for the future render the learning of these verbs an easy and agreeable task. Indeed, so great is the felicity of the subject, that no elementary work in Greek, or any other language, can present so happy a specimen of grammatical analysis.”

“To this edition is annexed, what is wanting in the two former, a plate of *Abbreviations*. And here the writer would recommend, as a necessary and elegant attainment to those who would understand the Greek language, the art of drawing its characters with neatness and precision. Mr. Hodgkin, a respectable man, and useful teacher, has labored to diffuse this accomplishment: the rules and plates which he has published for this purpose, ought to be in the hands of all school-masters.”^a

Our limits on the present occasion will not permit us to enter on that copious analysis of this excellent little work, which we had meditated, and we are reluctantly compelled to content ourselves with one or two extracts.

In page 200, Mr. Jones remarks, that “learned men have asserted, that in some places *καλεομαι* conveys the same precise sense with *ειμι*, vid. Callim. in Jov. 20. But it carries the additional idea of being *proclaimed* or *celebrated*, *υιοι θεου κληθησονται*, *they shall be called*, i. e. they shall be announced as such before

^a The Plates have been inserted in our former Nos. Ed.

an assembled universe. Juno reminds Jupiter of her rank, by telling him, *ση παρακοιτις κεκλημαι, I am called*, i. e. celebrated to fame as thy consort."

This observation was, we believe, first made by the writer of the article on Professor Monk's edition of the *Hippolytus*, inserted in the *British Critic*, and it has been subsequently confirmed in some notices of the *same* work, which appeared in the *Classical Journal*, where we have the additional remark, that *καλεομαι* never can be used but with *persons*.

As much has been lately said in the *Classical Journal* on the *Doctrine of the Association of Ideas*, as applicable to the illustration of language, we shall quote what Mr. J. says upon the subject; for, as Mr. Walter WHITE was the first who endeavoured to explain any English writer by this means, so Mr. J. seems to have been the first, who has employed this principle of association to elucidate the Greek and Roman writers.

"Association may be considered as influencing the government of words, or the choice of words, or the meaning of words.

Association influences the government of words. This influence, styled by Grammarians *Attraction*, sometimes causes a noun, in consequence of its proximity to a transitive verb, to be put in the accusative, which should more regularly be used in the nominative, in connexion with the succeeding verb. *Οἶδα σε τις ει*, Mark i. 24. *I know thee who thou art*, for *οἶδα τις ει συ*, *I know who thou art*. *Ὅσας την θεων ισχυν* ὅση, *you see the power of the gods, how great it is*, for *ὅσας ὅση εστι η των θεων ισχυς*, *you see how great is the power of the gods*. *Ουκ εστιν ηντινα παποτε ουκ ηρξεν* *αρχην*, *there is not what public office he did not sustain*, for *ουκ εστιν αρχη*, *ηντινα παποτε ουκ ηρξεν*, *there is no public office, which he did not sustain*.

Φημι κατανευσαι Κρονιωνα, &c.—*αστραπτων επιδεξια*, Il. ii. 350. *I assert that Jupiter, flashing out auspicious omens*, for *κατηνευσε*, or *ὅτι κατηνευσε Κρονιων*. *Τον λογον ὃν απεστειλε τοις υιοις Ισραηλ ευαγγελιζομενος ειρηνην δια Ιησου Χριστου*, *αυτος εστι παντων κυριος*. Acts x. 36. *the word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace through Jesus Christ, this is the lord of all*—*τον λογον*, attracted by *απεστειλε*, instead of *ὁ λογος* the nominative to *εστι*, *this word is lord of all*; meaning that the Christian doctrine was not, as at first supposed, to be confined to the Jews, but to extend to all nations, and to acquire a sovereign authority in the breasts of men. *Τον ατρον ὃν κλωμεν*, *ουχι κοιωνια του σωματος του Χριστου εστι*, Cor. ix. 16. *Is not the bread we break a partici-*

pation of the body of Christ—τον αβτον for ὁ αβτος. Vide Matthew xxi. 42. where a similar attraction occurs.

On the other hand, a noun, which should more regularly be in the accusative, is used in the nominative, attracted by the subject of a preceding verb.

Εὐχεται ορνίς γενεσθαι, she prayed to become a bird—ορνίς for ορνίθα. Μοι ομοσπον προφρων ἀρηξείν, being ready to defend me, swear (that)—for πρόσφρων ἀρηξείν, swear that you are ready to defend me. Μὴ τῷ οικεῖος εἶναι πιστευῶν ἀμελῇ, not to neglect (his relations) confiding (for respect and affection) in being a relative—οικεῖος, attracted by ἀμελῇ, for οικεῖον in connection with εἶναι.

In the following, and such other examples, the construction is perfectly correct and regular. Καὶ ἅμα ἡθομένη αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ποιήσιν οἰομένων καὶ τ' ἄλλα σοφωτάτων εἶναι ἀνθρώπων, Plato's defence of Socrates, I at the same time perceived from them, (meaning the poets) thinking themselves, on account of their poetry, the wisest of men in other things. Here the whole clause is in the genitive, as expressing the origin of what Socrates perceived; οἰομένων being used participially in the sense of the infinitive, and σοφωτάτων put necessarily in the same case as predicate to αὐτῶν οἰομένων. Nevertheless an English writer would have said, I perceive that, because of their poetical talents, they suppose themselves to be the wisest of men also in other subjects—αὐτοὺς οἰεσθαι σοφωτάτους εἶναι ἀνθρώπων. Μοι κρατίστον ἐστὶ μαθητὴ σὺ γενεσθαι, It is most eligible for me to become thy disciple. Here again, μοι means the same person with μαθητῇ, and therefore with the strictest propriety put in the same case. The whole clause is the subject to ἐστὶ. Thus, for me to become thy disciple is most eligible. See the Index of Forster's Plato under the word genitivum.

Καὶ τῆδε νῦν πορπατον ἀσφαλῶς, ἵνα

Μαθῇ σοφίστης ὡν Δίος γυθεστέρος. Prometheus Vincit. 61.

And now clasp this secure, that being a craftsman, less quick than Jove, he might learn, namely, that he is so; ὡν being attracted by σοφίστης to agree with it as a participle, instead of being the infinitive εἶναι after μαθῇ.

In the same Play, line 200, we read,

Στᾶσις τ' ἐν ἀλληλοῖσιν ἀρῶνυντο

Οἱ μὲν θέλοντες ἐκβαλλεῖν ἑβρας Κρόνον,

Ὅς ζεὺς ἀνασσοὶ ἔθεν, οἱ δὲ τοῦμπαλιν

Σπυδόντες ὡς ζεὺς μήποτε ἀρχεῖεν θεῶν.

A dispute arose among themselves: some of the gods, being desirous of expelling Saturn from his throne, that Jupiter might reign; others, on the contrary, urging that Jupiter should not rule the gods.

The nominatives οἱ μὲν—οἱ δέ, which critics call nominativi con-

sequentia, have no corresponding verb: but the anomaly proceeded from the writer's taking, by association, *στασις*, *dispute*, for the gods, *δαίμονες*, *disputing*; as though he had written, *δαίμονες στασιαζόντες ἐν ἀλληλοῖσιν ὠροῦντο, οἱ μὲν, &c.*

A noun, that should be in the genitive or dative, is often changed to the accusative, attracted by an infinitive verb.

Thus Thucydides—*Ἄνδρων γὰρ σωφρονῶν μὲν ἐστὶ, εἰ μὴ ἀδικοῖντο ἡσυχάζειν ἀγαθὸν δὲ ἀδικοῦμενους, ἐκ μὲν εἰρήνης πολεμεῖν, ἐν δὲ παρασχόν ἐκ πολέμου πάλιν συμβῆναι*, *it is the part of moderate men to live peaceably, if they are not injuriously treated; but of brave men, when injustice is done them, out of peace to make war, and being successful, out of war to make pence*—*ἀδικοῦμενους* in reference to *πολεμεῖν*, and not *ἀδικοῦμενων* agreeing with *ἀγαθὸν*. Sophocles, *Elec.* 905, writes, *παρεστὶ μὲν (σοὶ) στένειν πλουτοῦ πατρῶου κτήσιν ἐστέρημενῃ: παρεστὶ δὲ ἀλγεῖν ἀλεκτρα γηρασκούσαν*, *it awaits thee deprived of thy father's inheritance to sigh; it awaits thee growing old without a home to grieve*. See verse 480 of the same Play, also the *Crito* of Plato, Sec. 13.

The relative, instead of being the accusative after its governing verb, often assumes, in consequence of attraction, the case of its antecedent.

Χρῶμαι οἷς ἔχω, I use the means which I possess, for *χρῶμαι ἃ ἔχω*. *Ἐπίστευσε τῷ λόγῳ, ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, he believed the word which Jesus said*, John iv. 50. *ὃν εἶπεν* for *ὃν εἶπεν*. *Μεμνομένος ὧν ἐπραξεν, remembering the things which he did*, for *μεμνομένος τῶν πραγμάτων, ἃ ἐπραξεν*.

The influence of association causes a term prominent in the mind of the writer to be used absolutely in the nominative at the beginning of a sentence, though a more regular arrangement of his ideas required it to be placed at the close of one of the oblique cases.

Thus, *Gold, they shall not delight in it, for, they shall not delight in gold*, Isaiah xiii. 18, *He, who conquers and preserves my works to the end, to him I will give authority, &c.* Rev. ii. 26. *ὁ νικῶν καὶ τηρῶν μέχρι τῆς τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, δώσω αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν*, for *αὐτῷ τῷ νικῶντι*, &c. *δώσω ἐξουσίαν*. So also writes Homer, *Il.* vi. 510. when comparing the swiftness, with which Paris flew from the citadel to the embattled plains, to the velocity with which a well-fed horse escapes from the stall to the frequented meads.

*Ὁ δ' ἀγλαίῳ πεποιθὸς
Ῥιμφα ἱ γούνα φερεῖ μετὰ τ' ἠδὲ καὶ νομὸν ἵππων,*
But he priding in his beauty, his limbs rapidly conveyed him to the accustomed pasture of the horses, for τῷ δ' ἀγλαίῳ πεποιθὸς γούνα, &c. the limbs of him priding in his beauty, &c.

To this may be referred such examples as the following—

Notice of Schaefer's Ed. of Brunck's *Anacreon*. 27.

Πολλή γὰρ (ἡ στρατία) οὖσα, οὐ πάσης ἐστὶ πολὺς ὑποδεξασθαι, Thucyd. *the army being numerous, it will not be in the power of every city to accommodate them.* In strict propriety the historian should have written, πολλῆς γὰρ τῆς στρατίας οὐσῆς, οἱ περὶ γὰρ πολλή ἡ στρατία ἦν, *since the army was numerous.*

Homer should thus have described the horses of Rhesus: Του δὲ ἵπποι καλλίστοι, ὧν ἰδὼν, ἦδε μέγιστοι, λευκότεροι χιόνος, θάειν δ' ἀνεμοῖσι ὅμοιοι, *The horses of this man were the handsomest and largest I have ever seen, being whiter than snow, and like the wind in swiftness.* But instead of this he says, του δὲ, καλλίττους ἵππους ἰδὼν, ἦδε μέγιστους, λευκότεροι χιόνος, &c. Il. x. 436. The same poet was going to say, Νυν δ' αὖ τοὺς, ὅσοι το Πελασγικὸν Ἀργὸς ἐνεμοντο, &c. ἀρχὴν Ἀχιλλεύς, *Achilles commanded those who inhabited the Pelasgic Argos.* But in the room of this, he writes, νυν δ' αὖ τοὺς, ὅσοι το Πελασγικὸν Ἀργὸς ἐνεμοντο, &c. τῶν αὖ πεντήκοντα νέων ἦν ἀρχὸς Ἀχιλλεύς, Il. ii. 681—685."

As to the instance adduced from the *Prometheus Vincit*, v. 61., Mr. J. cannot be ignorant that Mr. Barker has, with what success we pretend not to determine, in the *Class. Journ.* endeavoured to demonstrate in two or three articles, to which *Sidneyensis* has replied, that the passage is capable of a different interpretation, viz. "That he may know that, cunning as he is, he is not so cunning as Jupiter." To these papers we refer both Mr. J. and our readers.

NOTICE OF

ANACREONTIS CARMINA. *Accedunt quædam e LYRICORUM RELIQUIIS. E recensione et cum notis Rich. Fr. Phil. BRUNCKII, Edidit God. Henr. SCHAEFER.* Lipsiæ. 1811. 24mo. pp. xv + 100 = 115.

THIS little work is part of a "*Corpus Poetarum Græcorum*;" which, as our readers are probably aware, Schaefer, the industrious German, is editing, "*ad fidem optimorum librorum.*" As it is merely a reprint of Brunck's edition, the merits of which are well known among scholars, it will not be necessary to make any critical remarks on the text; we shall therefore content ourselves with transcribing from the preface some emendations which the editor has made in the text of the small edition of Euripides,

which was published at the same time with Anacreon and Xenophon.

"Euripid. Electr. v. 256. vulgo legitur.

ἀγνέμε' ἔχων τί θεῖον, ἢ σ' ἀναξίων;

Hinc verbum ἀναξίου, ceteris lexicographis ossisum, Schneiderus ascivit. Sed ego hoc verbum græcum esse nego. Itaque dedi: ἀγνέμ' ἔχ. τί θ. ἢ σ' ἀπαξίων; Sic confusa in Diog. Laert. vii. 105. ἀναξίαν et ἀπαξίαν. V. Addenda ad Gregor. Corinth. p. 922. Ibid. v. 306. Editiones habent:

πρῶτον μὲν, οἷς ἐν πέπλοις αὐλίζομαι.

Scripsi: πρ. μ. οἷς ἐν πέπ. στολίζομαι. Sic Carm. Anacreont. xxviii. v. 29. sq. Στολίσον τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὴν Ἵποπορφύρεσι πέπλοις. Ipse Euripides voce στολμὸς de πέπλοις aliquoties usus est.

Ion. v. 297.: τιμᾶ, τιμᾶ, ὡς μὴ ποτ' ὠφελόν σ' εἰσθεῖν. Fœde corruptum hunc versum (v. Porson. supplem. præfat. ad Hecub. p. xxi. Lips.) sic mihi videor ad sanioiorem rationem revocasse:

ἄτιμα τιμᾶ, μή ποτ' ὠφελόν σφ' ἰδεῖν.—Conf. v. 299.

Iphig. Aul. v. 448. sqq.: καὶ ἵδ' ἄρ' ἑκκεῖται ῥαδίως αὐτοῖς ἔχει, Ἀνολβα τ' εἰπεῖν, τῷ δὲ γενναίῳ φύσιν ἅπαντα ταῦτα.

Primam vocem postremi versus, quam nemo facile dubitet vitium contraxisse, viri docti variis conjecturis emendare conati sunt. Mihi visa est mutanda esse in ἅπαντα. *difficilia*. Opponitur ῥαδίως ἔχει. Suidas: Ἀπαντα—δυσχερῆ. Ceterum literas ν et π sæpissime confusa esse a scribis, docetur pluribus locis in nova editione Gregorii Corinthii. Vid. p. 716. 726. 730. 747. et 922. Ibid. v. 907.: ἐπὶ τίνος σπυδαστέον μοι μᾶλλον, ἢ τέκνου πέρι; Sic vulgo editum est. Sed exitus hujus versus satis docet, etiam initio scribendum fuisse περὶ τίνος. Adde quod frequentissima est confusio præpositionum ἐπὶ et περὶ, cujus causam indicavit præstantissimus Bastius, his literis ante paucos dies immaturo lugubrique fato ereptus, in Commentat. Palæograph. p. 783. ubi in Mythographi loca vere me correxisse ὡς καινοτομοῦσαν περὶ τὰ θεῖα, nemo dubitabit, qui contulerit hunc Platonis Euthyphr. c. 2. p. 12. Ed. Fisch. ὡς οὖν καινοτομοῦντός σου περὶ τὰ θεῖα. Similiter Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 2. 16. καὶ περὶ τοὺς μυθοφόρους ἐκαινούργαι. In Scholiis Tzetzarum ad Lycophron. v. 683. pro vulg. παρὰ Τειρεσίου e codicibus Vitebergensibus Müllero nostro dare placuit περὶ Τειρεσίου. Sane hoc propius verum est: nam Scholiasta scripsit ἐπὶ Τειρεσίου, iudice Tiresia. Sic Plutarch. Mor. T. i. p. 711. Wytt. Πρεσβύτερος δὲ πενιχεῶς ἀξιοῦσης ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κριθῆναι, κ. τ. λ.

Rhes. v. 115.:—νικώμενος μὲν, τήνδε μὴ μόλης πόλιν.

Recte vertunt: non poteris redire. Sed hic sensus ut existeret, debebant scribere, ut ego scripsi:

νικώμενος μὲν, τήνδε μὴ οὐ μόλης πόλιν.

* Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit:
Nulli flebilior quam mihi.

Obiter moneo, in antecedentibus v. 110. φεύγειν non esse cum Musgravio sollicitandum. Verte: adeo inflatus es, ut opineris, Græcos fugere. Prægnans enim hic vis est verbi ἐξαίρεσθαι: quapropter infinitivus φεύγειν recte sequitur. Xenophon Hellen. iv. 5—12. κατεφρόνουν δὲ διὰ τὰς ἐμπροσθεν τύχας, μηδένα ἂν ἐπιχειρῆσαι σφίσιν. ubi cum nonnullis visum esset post τύχας inseri oportere participium οἰόμενοι, unde penderet infinitivus ἐπιχειρῆσαι, vere monuit criticus eximius in Addend. edit., Schneider. p. 121. κατεφρόνουν h. l. esse καταφρονητικῶς ὄντο. Ibid. v. 4, 45. μάλα πρόσθεν μῦθα φρονῶντες μὴ ὑπείξιν τοῖς Θηβαίοις; quod Leunclavius bene vertit, *quamquam—prius clatus animis se minime Thebanis cessuros existimassent.*

Troad. v. 554.: ἔδωκεν παρ' ὕπνω. De vitio vocis ὕπνω viri docti consentiunt: dissentiunt de medela. Ego edidi: ἔδωκεν παρ' αἴνῳ, memor confusionis horum nominum, cujus exempla dedi in not. ad Plin. Epistol. p. 145. b. et in præfat. p. xiv. His nunc addo var. lect. ad Eurip. Cyclop. v. 589. et Reiz. ad Aristotel. Polit. p. 74. (coll. V. D. in der Neuen Philol. Biblioth. iii. p. 185. et Schneider. ad Aristotel. Polit. p. 456.) Ceterum eandem loci Troadum emendandi rationem video placuisse Erfurdio ad Sophocl. Œd. R. v. 773. p. 110. ed. minor." Schaefer. Præf. pp. viii—xii.

Schaefer does not profess to have made any emendations of Anacreon's or the other Poems contained in this neat little volume: "nihil mihi, specimina typographica legenti, nisi passim in accentus, interpunctionem similesque minutiis, licere arbitratus sum." Præf. p. vii. At the bottom of the page, however, he proposes, what we are disposed to think an ingenious emendation of one passage: it is as follows.

"P. 67. in Aristotelis Pæani versus penultimus fortasse sic scribendus: Διὸς Πενίου σέβας ἄζουσαι: ut hic etiam, quod toties factum, α et αυ, ζ et ξ confusæ videantur. Quod si recte conjeci, alterum h. l. exemplum habemus activi ἄζω. Σέβαρ ἄζειν autem dicitur, ut σέβας ἐταιρῆσθαι v. καταρῆσθαι. V. Porson. ad Euripid. Med. v. 750."

We shall probably, at some future time, consider Schaefer's small editions of the other Greek writers.—The present work seems very correctly printed as far as we have seen: and, as might be expected from a modern production of the Leipzig press, is most beautifully executed. It is an admirable substitute for Brunck's editions, which are all scarce: the text is, we think, in several cases improved by alterations of the punctuation: and it possesses another advantage, which is, that, while Brunck's Anacreon sells for half a guinea, this may be procured for the trifling sum of three shillings.

OBSERVATIONES CRITICÆ IN EURIPIDEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

IN the year 1799 a duodecimo edition of the *Cyclops* was printed at Nuremberg. To this little volume are subjoined a few critical observations by the Editor, M. George Frederic Daniel Goes. As the work is extremely scarce, and the notes contain some useful matter, I have been at the pains to transcribe them for the use of your *Journal*, in which so many scarce and valuable tracts have been judiciously reprinted. The text is the same with that of Hoepfner, Lips. 1789. 1814. L. C.

Vers. 15. De verbo λαβῶν Jacobs V. Cel. in animadversionibus in Euripidis trag. et frag. tom. 1. pag. 119. hæc scribit: satis quidem expedita sententia, Silenum ad navis gubernaculum condesse; sed in verbis hæremus. Δόρυ enim, non quod *Heathius* voluit, *clavum gubernaculi*, sed ipsam navem significare, satis cum ex aliis locis, tum ex Euripidis Helena vers. 1584. adparet, ubi est: ἐξέπεισεν εἰσβηναι δόρυ, et in ipso Cyclope, v. 19. δορύ, quod nemo facile de gubernaculo intelliget; neque tamen verisimile est poetam idem verbum intra tam paucorum verborum spatium tam diverso significatu adhibuisse. Quæ cum ita sint, difficile dictu est, quo v. λαβῶν referendum sit, quod cum v. δορύ conjungi nequit. His rationibus ductus λαβῶν in mendo cubare suspicor, et corrigendum: θακῶν. Vocabulum δορύ, 1) significat *hastam*, 2) omne lignum, imprimis nauticum, 3) navigium ipsum: proinde δορύ vere significare posset ex sententia *Heathii clavum gubernaculi*. Nec minus plura exempla, quæ hic enumerare supersedeo, quemque edocent, eadem verba omnino intra paucum spatium apud vet. poetas occurrere. Equidem v. λαβῶν ad ἀμφῆρες referendum esse, *navigium* significans quod *utrinque remis impellitur*, arbitror et vulgatam lectionem satis probam amplectens ita interpretor verba: *Ipse in extremâ puppi gubernaculum tenens navem regebam*.

Vers. 30. Cel. Jacobs non negat quidem, sensum quod attinet, lectionem vulgatam defendi posse: attamen tentavit pro μένων—δάμων, quod ejus ex sententia proxime a vulgata abest, neque exemplo caret vers. 118., et Iphigen. in T. 949. οἴκων ὄντας ἐν ταυτῷ στέγει, nec non Catull. carm. lxiv. 247. sive etiam μελάθρων, quod cum per compendium sic scriberetur μέλων, facile in μένων abire potuit. Sic Alcest. 247. μελάθρων στέγαι. Ingeniosam vel hanc esse amicissimi Jacobs conjecturam, nemo negabit, licet non satis intelligatur, cur a vulgata lectione recedendum sit, quæ utique Sileni conditionem significantius exprimit, qui manens

* Hæc conjectura metro repugnat.

juvus est, scopis verrere et alveos implere, unde pecora bibunt, quæ filiis pascere licitum est.

Vers. 39. Florens Christianus ingeniose, sed sine omni causa legit: κάμῳ, quod nec Barnesio ineptum visum est, adque Silenum esset trahendum, qui comes Bacchi erat, quem sequebantur Satyri. Huic conjecturæ Musgravius favere ait, quod συνασπίζειν plerumque sine accusativo jungatur, cujus rei exempla attulit. Idem hæc monet κάμους, ita MSS. Stephani, quorum auctoritati obtemperandum putavi. Editio Ald. κάμοι, unde et κάμον facias, quod fortasse elegantius. Hoc κάμον s. κάμους etiam Heathius præfert, comessationes una peragentes. Hactenus Cel. Hoepfnerus, Cyclopiæ editor doctissimus; verum mihi neutrum placet. Prima conjectura non necessaria, altera satyris, ex quibus chorum constare apertum est, nullo modo adcommodata est. Vocab. κάμοι vel pro singul. κάμοις, quod facile intelligas, positum est, vel, quod magis placet, pro κάμοις legendum est κάμω, quum vos in orbe saltatorio Bacchi sodales eratis, siquidem Bacchus, καμάζειν πρὸς Ἀλθαίαν dicitur, quo eam Satyri comitabantur.

Vers. 44. et 46. Pro τῶδε et δινῶεν præeunte Musgravio in textum recepi τὰδε et δινάεν, quod nemini displicebit, et Hoepfnerum v. Cel. non fecisse pœnitet.

Vers. 49. Verba οὐ τὰδ' οὐ, οὐ τὰδε νέμῃ, quibus Satyri oves, quas pascunt, appellant, dudum me offenderunt; contra unius codicis lectio οὐ τὰδ', οὐτ' αὖ τὰδε νέμῃ arrisit, cui clarissimum Jacobs in animadversionibus in Euripidis trag. et fragm. tom. 2. pag. 158. adsentiri postmodum lubenter vidi.

Vers. 60. et 61. Omnium de his versibus criticorum conjecturas, quas æque diligenter collegit atque accurate examinavit cl. Hoepfnerus, denuo recensere et piget et supervacaneum arbitror. Omitto quoque, quam modo Cyclopiæ laudatus editor protulit interpretationem, qui ἀμφιβάλλειν esse idem, quod χωρὶς βαλνείν invita Minerva censet, nec non quam equidem olim in commentationis in Agamemnonem Æschylum particula tertia pag. 22. conjecturam βᾶθ' ἀμφιβαλεῖς dedi, cum verum viderit censor edit. Hoepfner. in actis literariis universalibus, quæ Jenæ innotescunt, doctissimus, ἀμφιβάλλεις h. l. significare i. q. ἀμφισβητεῖς, et vertendum esse dubitas arbitratus. Attamen interrogationis signum post v. νόμους ponendum esse nullus dubito, ut sensus exeat: in stabulum ire forte dubitas? In Ætneis namque scopulis, ubi stabulum fingendum est, neque Bacchus, neque saltationes, neque Bacchæ thyrsoferæ sunt.

Vers. 71. Miror, neminem interpretum vidisse, v. πέτρῃαν, quod nullo modo quadrat, propter præcedentis versus vocabulum μέλπω, cum poetarum more ad βάκχῃς referendum esset, ab insecio grammatico esse corruptum. Equidem πέτραι legere et textum recipere nullus dubitavi.

Vers. 91. Acuta est Musgravii observatio, se neque quenquam

ingenisse, qui ἐμβάλλειν στέγην dixerit, neque, etiamsi græce dicatur, hic locum habere posse, Ulysse cum sociis nunc primum in conspectum prodeunte. Quo minus tamen amplectar conjecturam ejus—ἀξένον γυήν, prohibet literarum major, quam forte par est, diversitas. Propius certe ad vulgaræ scripturæ auctus nos conjicimus: ἀξένον τε γῆν, cet., ut cum ἰσασί jungatur hoc participium. Ingeniose et præclare hæc cl. Jacobs libro sæpius laudatus tom. 1. animadvertit. Verba itaque, paulo aliter a me juncta sic vertenda esse puto: *Væ illis miseris! Quicumque tandem sint, ignorant, qualem dominus se gerat, nesciuntque, se feram et ab hominum consortio remotum terram ingressos esse.*

Vers. 169. Vera est emendatio vocabuli παρασκευασμένου, in quo nævum hære quilibet græcæ linguæ peritus facile intelligit, quam de Euripidis tragædiis optime meritis Jacobs lib. laudat. tom. 1. pag. 122. adtulit. Corrigit nimirum περισκεπασμένου, quod unice v. Λημῶνος congruit.

Vers. 178—185. Mirum sane videtur, hos versus interpretum neminem, cel. Wakefieldo excepto, qui in silv. crit. part. iv. p. 195. v. φοροῦντα mutare vult in φανόντα, i. e. λαμπόντα, offendisse, cum et interpunctione et sensu laborent. Equidem non inauspicata, ut mihi videor, manu interrogationis signum, in fine vers. 179. sublatum post v. πρῶτον posui, ita ut v. πρῶτον cum διεκροτήσατε conjungatur, et versus 180. quasi parenthesi inclusus exhibeatur. Pro v. φοροῦντα ut φοροῦσα legamus, et rei ratio et verborum nexus postulare videntur.

Vers. 244. Versum hunc esse corruptum omnes interpretes uno ore consentiunt, et inde facile adparet, quod v. ἔδοντος cum ἀνθρώπους nullo modo conjungi possit, neque v. κρενόμενῳ habeat, quo referendum sit. Præ ceteris mihi semper placuit emendatio cel. Ruhnkenii διδόντος δαῖτα τοῦ κρενόμενου, donec lgeram, quod censor edit. Hoepfner. in act. litter. univers. Jenens. excellentissimus ἔφοντος δαῖτα τοῦ κρενόμενου conjecerat. Prima faciliior, altera elegantior est, ita ut difficile sit disceptatu, quod in mente poeta habuerit.

Vers. 269. Verba ἢ κακῶς οὗτοι κακοὶ illustris. Wakefieldus in silv. crit. part. ii. pag. 53. contra Musgravium, invita sane Minerva, pro κακοὶ Euripidem scripsisse καλοὶ autumantem, optimo jure defendit, et locutionis veritatem multis exemplis probavit.

Vers. 298. Vario modo critici versum tentarunt, ut longius esset et a voluntate alienum, eorum sive interpretationes sive conjecturas laudare, quas cel. Hoepfnerus ea, qua par est, cura recensuit. Equidem jam olim accurate animadvertisse videor, nævum non in v. ἀποστρέφου, sed in vv. εὐ λόγους potius hære, quapropter emendationem, quam in comment. prima in Æschyl. Agamemnonem, pag. 51. proposueram, εὐλόγους ἀποστρέφου repetere

et textui inserere non gravatus sum. Verte: *jure meritoque instituta mortalium respice.*

Vers. 325—326. De his versibus emendandis sagacissimus Jacobs bene meritus est. Verba ejus sunt: Musgravius conjecit, δαινόμενος, εὐ στέγοντι γαστέρ' ἐψίαν *ventri bene capienti ludibrium*, quod ut doctum ita nimis longe quæsitum est. Melius placet quod proximo versu emendavit: εἰ' ἐκπίαν. Denique hæremus in verbis πέπλον κρούω, quæ, quocunque tandem modo explicaveris, difficultatem relinquent. Equidem totum hunc locum sic refingam:

ἢ μόσχον ὅπῃον ἢ τι θήριον δάκος
δαινόμενος εὐ, στέγων γαστέρ' ἐψίαν
εἰ' ἐκπίαν γάλακτος ἀμφορέα, βδέλλον
κρούω, cet.

Odys. I.

Cyclops γαστέρα στένων, *ventrem implens* carnibus est Homericus ille, qui μεγάλην ἐπλήσατο νηδύν. Vid. animadvers. in Euripidis trag. tom. I. pag. 124. Mihi in mentem venit, εὐ στένω, ita ut verbum στένω cum præcedente ἔχω cohæreat, nec interpretor implere, sed in proprio significato sumo, i. e. *et dum epulor, valde propter ventrem repletum anhele*. Nonne significantius et dicentis characteri accommodatius? quod denique ad loquendi rationem πέπλον κρούω attinet, nihil video, quod nos movere possit, ut a vulgata lectione recedamus, quæ non modo satis usitata est, sed conjecturæ etiam clarissimi Jacobs eatenus longè præferenda, quatenus vix, et ne vix quidem, κρούειν βδέλλον dici possit.

Vers. 336. Lectionem hujus versus vulgatam eamque veram ὡς τὸ πῖν restitui, pro qua Musgravius legendum esse ὡς τοῦμπειν monet, quamque Heathius corrigit ὡς τοῦκπειν. Namque non modo verbum simplex præstat, sed metrum etiam sanum est, siquidem, quod utrumque fugit, ultima pedis iambei syllaba, quamvis sit natura brevis, a tragicis passim producitur, quoties cum illa finiatur verbum. Vid. exempla, quæ Wakefieldus in Silv. Crit. part. prim. p. 81. laudavit, qui lib. I. part. 1, pag. 94. eandem sententiam protulit, nec non Lucian. de Parasito 7. allegavit, quocum Plautus Pseudol. 5. 10. conferendus est.

Vers. 360—361. Ab emendatione quam dudum margini adposueram, recedere non possum. Pro σκάφος lego σκάφει ut conjungatur cum v. μῶψ, et interpretor verba: *noli mihi, noli aliquid tribuere, solus soli ventri navis*, i. e. ventri tuo, navis ventri simili, infer. V. κόμψεν, teste Hesychio, idem est, ac βασιτάζειν, ἐπιφέρειν. Vid. Trill. observ. critic. p. 144. Aptè hic, et vers. 501. Cyclopi's venter, cum navis ventre comparatur, cujus rei exempla apud Romanos quoque extare notum est. Vid. commentationis meæ in Æschyleum Agam. part. tert. pag. 18.

Vers. 364—365. Verba αὐτὸς ἔχει θυσίαν, quæ criticis multas difficultates moverunt, insulsum esse glossema vocabulorum ἔπος

ἄβριος θυμάτων, ex verbis οὐκ ἔχει θυσίαν, margini interpretationis causa adscriptis ortum, olim jam in commentat. prim. in Æschyl. Agamem. pag. 23. docui, et hic repetere non erubesco: quibus omissis, omnia bene coherere, et plana sanæque esse manifestum sit. Ἀποβρίμιος θυμάτων h. l. dictum est, sicuti ἀχαλκός ἀσπίδων, ἀπεπλος φαρέων, ἀνέφητος κοκυμάτων, ut alia exempla omittam, quæ poetarum Græcorum lectores non fugiunt.

Vers. 391—394. Aliorum interpretationes sive emendationes æque, ac conjecturam, quam olim lib. I. pag. 24. dederam, relinquens cum clarissimo Jacobs Heathium sequor, qui, leni verborum transpositione adhibita, hos versus in eum modum constituit:

ὀβελούς τ' ἄκρως μὲν ἐγκεκαυμένους πυρὶ
 ξεστούς δρεπάνῳ ὕκ, ἀλλὰ πελεκέων γνάθοις
 αἰτναῖά γε σφαγεῖα, παλιούρου κλάδῳ:

σφαγεῖα αἰτναῖα. ut recte cl. Jacobs, lib. I. tom. II. p. 159. observavit, instrumenta sunt *ingentia*, ut omnia, quibus Cyclops ad usum domesticum utebatur. Vid. Aristoph. Pac. v. 72. et Hesych. sub ἄ. αἰτναῖον.

Vers. 397. Cel. Jacobs in tomo secundo animadvers. in Euripidis tragœd. scribit; verba ῥυθμῶ τινι valde esse jejuna, cum præsertim diverso modo a Cyclope mactati in proximis versibus narrentur, et scribendum esse autumat; ἔσφαξ' ἐταίρων τῶν ἐμῶν οὐχ' ἐν ῥυθμῶ. Hanc emendationem etsi vir præclarissimus exemplis stabilire studeat, neque tamen metrum admittere videtur, neque de modo mactandi h. l. sermo est. Si locus noster in mendo eubet, verum omnino est codicem Paris. ad eum restituendum ansam præbere, qui verbis transpositis τινι ῥυθμῶ exhibet. Propterea eatenus clarissimq. Jacobs adsentiri non gravor, quatenus, particulā οὐχ' omitta, legendum ἐν ῥυθμῶ, i. e. uno tenore, sive uno ictu censeo.

Vers. 431—433. Lubenter h. l. cum clarissimo Jacobs Musgravi conjecturam, vocabula πτέρυγα, ἀλύς in πτέρυγα, σαλεύει mutantis amplector, quæ lepidæ temulenti senis descriptioni optime convenit. In sequentibus, ubi amicus suavissimus in verb. ἀνυκερδαίναν aliquid latere, quod temulentix significationem habeat, scribit, et corrigere vult; ἀσθενής γὰρ καὶ πόδ' ἄδρανῶν, πότου ἤπερ πρὸς cet.

Non de partibus sto, et conjecturam licet ingeniosam supervacaneam arbitror. Sensus vulgatæ lectionis satis expeditus est.

Vers. 446. Ex commentario, quo Cel. Hoepfnerus Cyclopem illustravit, doctissimo satis adparet, verba hujus versus ῥυθμοῖσι νιν interpretes valde turbasse, quorum autem emendationes partim longe petitas, partim nimis quæsitæ interpretationes iterum examinare mihi nequitiam in animo est. Primò obtutu intelligitur, poetam ῥυθμῶ σὺ νιν scripsisse. Jam alios idem in mente habuisse video, quibus nesciò quo jure adsensum Barnesius negaverit.

Vers. 501—504. Sensus horum versuum in tert. commentatione in Æschyl. Agamem. p. 18. vera olim interpunctione testi-

tuisse mihi videor. Post v. οἶνου puncti et post γάνυμαι δὲ com-
tis signum pono, unde lepidissimus et aptissimus sensus oritur ;
*Io! Io! Io! Plenus sum vini. Latior onustus oblitusque lauto
convivio usque ad infima ventris tabulata cœu navis oneraria.* Vo-
cabula δαίτος ἰβης quorum sensum interpretes fugisse miror, h. l.
posita sunt, sicuti Pind. Pyth. II. 147. χερὶν μισθόν. *Æschyl.*
Agamem. vers. 1458. εὐνης (sic pro corrupto v. θαλής ibidem scri-
bendum est) τῆς ἑμης χαλιδῆς. *Soph. Trachin.* v. 554. λυτῆριον λύπηρα,
i. e. *sanabilis dolor*, et in loco, de quo agimus, Euripidis δαίτας
καράς i. e. *navis oneraria*.

Vers. 509—514. De navis, quibus hi versus squalidi jacent,
diluendis exinde mihi sæpius cogitanti, nihil melius in mentem
venit, quam quod olim in commentatione sæpius laudata pag. 21.
proferre conatus sum. Me itaque conjecisse non pœnitet, Euripidem
pro δαίτα, quod ferri nequit, δαίται scripsisse, ad quam conjecturam
viam monstrat editio Barnesii, quæ δαίται ministrat. Sensus est ;
amatorie, amatorie oculis adspiciens (Cyclops) aula exst. *Amat
aliquis nos, sed mox lucerna accensa* (innuit torrem in Cyclopi
oculum mox intrudendum) *cutem tuam in roscida spelunca cœu molis
sponsa comburet i. e. deperiet, et variis coloribus caput tuum orna-
bunt.* Satyrus secum Cyclopem deridere et acriter cavillari in
aprico est. Nonne melius esset pro τις ἡμῶς scribere τιν' ἡμῶν, i. e.
aliquem nostrum?

Vers. 560. Miror novissimum doctissimumque Cyclopi edito-
rem, *Cel.* Hoepfnerum vulgatam hujus versus lectionem χ ὥπερ οὐκ
εἴμῃ, quæ partim jejunum sensum continere, partim non bene conve-
nire versui sequenti, qui uno spiritu Silenum ebibisse docet, facile
intelligitur, Musgravii emendationi sagacissimæ χ ὥσπερ οὐ καμῇ,
i. e. *sicuti non delassaberis, non gravaberis prætulisse.*

Vers. 584. Hunc versum æque bene clarissimum Jacobs. in
animadvers. tom. II. p. 162. *Cyclopi* adtribuendum esse, ac vers.
587. corrigendum censuit;

ἐνδον μὲν ὡς ἔνῃ τῷ δ' ὕπνῳ παρειμένος.
ταχ' ἐξ ἀναιδούς φάρυγγος ὠθήσει κρέα.

ACCOUNT OF

- The PRICES and PURCHASERS of the most valua-
ble Articles in the COLLECTION of the late JAMES
EDWARDS, Esq. sold by Mr. IVANS, April 5, 1815,
and Five following Days, at No. 26, Pall-Mall.

4. CONSTANTINI Lexicon Græcō Latinum, folio, best edition, russiæ,
gilt leaves. [9l. Perry] 1592.

49. Holland, Heroologia Anglica, hoc est Vitæ clarissimorum An-
golorum cum effigibus a P. 4. folio. This extraordinary fine copy for-
merly belonged to Buchelius, who wrote the Latin verses signed A. B.
under each portrait. He has made corrections and additions in a very

best hand throughout the volume, apparently with a view to a new edition. [15*l.* Miller.] 1620.

67 *Christophori Thuanii Tumulus, with his portrait.* Par. Patisson, 1583.—J. Thuanii Tumulus, Par. 1580. 4to. *large paper, morocco.* The copy of J. A. Thuanus. [10*l.* 10*s.* Dibdin.]

119 Johnson's Collection of the English Poets, from the time of Cowley, with Biographical Prefaces, *best edition*, 75 vol. 12mo. *green morocco.* [32*l.* Marquis of Ely.] 1790.

147 *Fables de La Fontaine*, 4 vol. folio, *large paper, with numerous plates after Oudry's designs, most brilliant impressions*, Marshal Montmorency's copy, *green morocco.* [22*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* Goldsmid.] Paris, 1755.

156 Andreino, l'Adamo, Sacra Representatione, 4to *first edition, cuts*, by C. A. Procacino, *rare, green morocco*, [15*l.* Burrell.] Milan, 1613.—This Italian mystery is supposed to have suggested to Milton the idea of his Paradise Lost.

162 Gesta Romanorum, folio, a very beautiful *Manuscript upon vellum*, of one of the most ancient Story-Books extant. It was executed for Charles VI. of France. It is written in a very legible hand, and is ornamented with nine very large Miniature Paintings, and a profusion of richly painted capitals, and various figures in gold and colors at the beginning of each Story; bound in vellum. [46*l.* Longman.]

164 Here begynneth the RECUYEL OF THE HISTORIES OF TROY, drawn out of Latyn into Frenche, by Raoul le Fèvre, and translated into Englishe by Caxton, begonne in Bruges 1468, and finyshed in Colen 1471, folio, *russia*, imperfect, but contains the Colophon with Caxton's Account of the time when he executed the work. This specimen of the first printing in our language was the Exercise of Caxton's apprenticeship in Germany, being three years before he introduced the Art into England. [43*l.* 1*s.* Longman.]

165 Walpole's Castle of Otranto, *printed upon vellum, blue morocco* [29*l.* 8*s.* Dibdin] Parma, 1791.—One of the most beautiful and fine specimens of a modern book printed upon vellum. The edition was printed by Bodoni, at the expence of Mr. Edwards, who had six copies taken off upon Italian vellum, from each of which the sheets were carefully selected to render this copy as perfect as possible.

211 Opere di Piranesi, namely, Antichite Romane, Vedute di Roma Sepolcri degli Scipione, Magnificenza ed Architettura di Roma, Opere Vatte, Fasi Consulares, Acqua Giulia, Antichite di Cora, Campus Martius, Antichite d'Albano e di Castel Gandolfo, Vasi e Candelabri, Colonna Trajana e Antonina, Antichite di Poestum, Teatro d'Brrolano, Maniere di adornare i Camial; 23 vol. bound in 17, Atlas folio, the original Roman editions, *very first impressions of the plates*, selected by Mr. E. a magnificent set, *bound in russia*. [315*l.* North.]

214 Anthologia Græca, *manuscript, folio.* [10*l.* 10*s.* Lunn.]—This is a transcript by the celebrated Brunck of 743 ineedited Greek Epigrams, from a MS. in the King of France's Library. The original compilation was made, by Guyet, who bequeathed it to Menage. In a note at the end of the volume, Brunck says he transcribed it in 1769,

"sedulo et quantum potui diligentia." It may be added that this transcript far exceeds the original in interest and value, from the notes and references to critical works with which Brunck has enriched it.

224 Auli Gellii Noctes Atticæ, fol. manuscript of the XV. century, upon vellum, with all the richness of illumination in miniatures, and capitals, which distinguish the fine Italian manuscripts of the Classics under the protection of the Medici family. The writing, both of the Greek and Latin, is in the boldest and finest style of the 15th century, from which Sweynheim and Pannartz formed their types; the arms of the family for whom it was executed are in the first page, bound in red morocco. [36l. 15s. Dibdin.]

263 Horatii Opera, manuscript of the XV. century, upon vellum, fol. red morocco. [125l. Dibdin.] This is a manuscript of the first splendor, both for writing and illumination. It was executed for Ferdinand I. King of Naples, who first introduced printing into his states, and was so ardent a collector of books and manuscripts, that Mr. Roscoe relates, that the Florentines, to conciliate him in a rupture, presented him with some fine manuscripts of the Classics; as the Palæ of Florence are seen among the ornaments, this may be one of them.

278 Livii Historiarum quæ supersunt, cum Epistola Joannis Andree Episcopi Aleriensis ad Paulum 2 Pont. Max. folio, first edition, printed upon vellum, in the original binding, morocco. [903l. Arch.] Romæ, MCCCCLXIX.—This splendid specimen of the press of Sweynheim and Pannartz is the only copy of the first edition of Livy known to exist upon vellum. It appears, by the arms at the bottom of the first page of the history, to have been taken off for Alexander VI. when Vice-Chancellor of the Roman See, and Governor of the Monastery of Soubiaco, where Sweynheim and Pannartz took up their abode (being a German monastery) when they introduced the art of printing into Italy.

287 Nonius Marcellus de Proprietate Sermonum, folio, printed upon vellum, with the title and 52 miniatures from the antique, in relief on pale blue ground, most exquisitely painted for the Medici Family, as appears by the arms in the beginning of the work, bound in morocco, [199l. 10s. Dibdin.] Ven. Jenson, MCCCCLXXVI. It is impossible for the beauty of this copy to be surpassed.

310 Prudentius, 4to. Manuscript of the X. Century upon vellum (formerly belonging to the Monastery of St. Gall), green morocco. [23l. 2s. Marquis of Douglas.]

317 Sifabonis Geographia, Latine, ex versione Guarini Veronensis et Gregorii Tiphernatis, folio, first edition, blue morocco. [42l. Dibdin.] Romæ, per Sweynheim et Pannartz MCCCCLXIX.—One of the very rare productions of the above Printers, (only 275 copies having been printed). See the Printers' address to Sixtus IV. in Vol. I. p. 1, of the Bibliotheca Spenceriana. It is one of the finest specimens of their press, and as Audiffredi says, "typus ita integer ac nitidus apparet, ut non sine jucunditate à Bibliophilis spectari possit."

377 Leonardo Da Vinci Regole e Precetti della Pittura, folio. Manuscript, with Original Drawings by Nicholas Poussin, morocco. [102l.

162. Thauæ.]—The original Manuscript of L. da Vinci was deposited with the Barberini Family. Mr. De Chantelou, Minister of France at the Court of Rome, wishing to obtain a transcript of the rules for drawing, employed Nicholas Poussin, then pursuing his studies at Rome, to make drawings of what L. Da Vinci described. These are the subjects:—4 Drawings of Anatomical Figures; 22 Drawings of Human Figures; 2 Heads in Profile; a Hand and a Horse. This volume exhibits an admirable specimen of N. Poussin's powers of drawing, and evinces an extraordinary combination of taste, spirit, fidelity, and science.

394. Sir W. Hamilton's Collection of Etruscan, Greek, and Roman Antiquities, taken from Etruscan Vases, 4 vol. folio: *Very scarce, fine copy in russia, with borders of gold.* [53l. 11s. Copley.] Naples, 1766.

469. Holinshed's Chronicles, with the Castrations, 3 vols. folio, *best edition, red morocco.* [18l. 18s. Singer.] 1586.

574. Rapin's History of England, and Tindal's Continuation, with *Vertue's heads and monuments, very fine impressions*, 6 vol. folio, *russia, gilt leaves.* [43l. 1s. Egerton.] 1732.—The Rapin is upon the *largest paper*, which is *very rare*, and the Continuation of Tindal upon *fine paper, a very fine set.*

587. Ashmole's History of the Order of the Garter, folio, *large paper, very fine impressions of the plates, a beautiful copy in blue morocco;* Duke of Newcastle's copy. [42l. North.] 1672.

612. Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, 3 vol. fol. *with all the plates, very fine copy, in the original binding in vellum, gilt leaves.* [38l. 17s. Sanders.] 1682.

624. Camden's Britannia, by Gough, 6 vol. fol. *Best edition, illustrated with more than 1000 Views from Grose, Stukeley, &c.* [52l. 10s. North.] 1806.

657. Loggan Oxonia Illustrata, fol. *morocco*, 1675.—Loggan Cantabrigia Illustrata, fol. *russia.* [21l. North.]

672. Croniques et Gestes des Treshaux et Tresvertueux Faitz de François Premier, commençans au temps de son Advènement à la Couronne, 1514, par André de La Vigne Croniqueur du Roy et Secrétaire ordinaire de la Royue, fol. [100l. Dibdin.]—A Magnificent Manuscript on vellum, with splendid miniatures and highly ornamented capitals at the beginning of each chapter, of which many are six inches by five, displaying all the richness of invention and grandeur of execution to which the art of illumination had arrived. The first miniature occupies the whole page, fifteen inches by ten and a half, and represents Francis on his throne, surrounded by his Court, and receiving the Book from the Author. The arms of Francis the First, quartered with those of his first wife, Claude de France, are on each side of the frame-work which surrounds the picture; her arms are painted separately in a cordon; *bound in green velvet.*

757. Salviani Historia Piscium et Aquatiliū Animalium, folio, *paper, large paper, ruled, a most beautiful copy, bound in morocco, in compartments, with the arms of Thuanus richly gilt.* [30l. 10s. Clarke.] Rome, 1554.

793 The Koran of Mohammed, written in the grandest and boldest of Oriental Characters, enriched throughout with brilliant illuminations. A most splendid Manuscript in the highest preservation. It was a present from Maulowa Mohammed Achmed to Nijul at Dowlah, fol. with a blue morocco case [52l. 10s. Marquis of Douglas.]

804 Biblia Pauperum, a Collection of Designs, rudely cut in wood, of the principal Historical Subjects in the Bible; interspersed with sentences above, below, in the middle, or in scrolls, according to the ancient manner of describing figures speaking, fol. [210l. Dibdin.] The extreme rarity of this book is well known; it is esteemed the first essay towards the art of printing by blocks of wood, before the invention of moveable types, and is generally attributed to Laurence Coster of Haerlem, between the years 1440 and 1450. A very fine and perfect copy, and none of the plates injured by being painted, which is generally the case; bound in morocco.

807 Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, edente Walton, et Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum, 8 vol. fol. very fine copies in blue morocco. The Bible is ruled, and has the original republican preface to the Polyglot. [61l. Watson.] Lond. 1657.

808 Biblia Sacra Latina, Vulgatæ Versionis, 2 vol. fol. [175l. Lloyd.] Moguntia, per Fust et Schöffer, MCCCCLXII. Printed upon vellum, and decorated with rich illumination. This is the first edition of the Latin Bible with a date. A magnificent copy, the finest which has been offered to public sale for many years. The book is as fair and fresh as when it came from the press; the leaves were carefully selected from two very fine copies, 2 vol. splendidly bound in blue morocco.

809 Biblia Sacra Latina, cum Interpretationibus Hebraicorum Nominum, 2 vol. fol. The first edition of the Latin Bible printed at Paris. A remarkably fine copy, in blue morocco. [34l. 2s. 6d. Triphook.] Par. MCCCCLXXVI. It has the following colophon:

Jam tibus undecimus lustris Francos Ludovicus
Rexerat! Ulicus Martinus itemque Michael
Orti Teutonia, hanc mihi composuere figuram
Parisi arte sua, me correctam vigilanter
Venalem in vico Jacoby sol aureus offert.

Which establishes the date of the impression to be 1476. This is the celebrated edition which attracted so much curiosity and discussion by the imposition practised on Lord Oxford by an alteration of the colophon, and which would have ascribed it to 1463. The edition, however, is unusually rare; and Mr. Edwards, who, from his valuable and extensive correspondence on the continent, obtained more early printed books than were ever imported by any one individual, was yet more than twenty years before he could obtain a fine copy.

810 Biblia Sacra Latina, fol. [115. 10s. Triphook.]. Ven. per Jenson, MCCCCLXXIX. Printed upon vellum. This beautiful copy, of an extremely rare edition of the Bible printed by Jenson, is the only one which has occurred in any sale for many years. It belonged to Sixtus IV. as appears by his arms in the beginning of the book. To this

Account of Mr. Edwards

magnificent Pontiff (the founder of the Vatican Library) Sweynheim and Pannartz addressed the well-known supplicatory letter for relief in consideration of the numerous splendid works which had been printed by them in Italy. The capitals are richly illuminated, and at the commencement is an elegant miniature; bound in red morocco.

821 *Evangelia Quatuor Græce*, fol. A magnificent Manuscript upon vellum, of the Tenth Century, most elaborately executed. The subject of each page is designated at the top in letters of gold. This grand Manuscript is in the highest preservation, and is one of the finest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospels extant. It is supposed to have been one of the Imperial Collection saved at the capture of Constantinople. It would be a most important acquisition to any library, public or private; bound in blue velvet, with bronze-gilt Medallions of the birth of Our Saviour and the adoration of the Magi on the sides. [210l. Payne.]

824 *Psalterium Græco-Latinum*, fol. A Manuscript of the Ninth Century upon vellum, of the first curiosity and importance, written in a very fair and legible hand, with this peculiarity—the Greek is written in Roman characters, by which means we elicit the curious and interesting knowledge of the exact pronunciation of the Greek Language, as spoken at that period when the Byzantine Empire was in its literary glory. A very learned antiquary has given the following illustration of the writing of the first page tending to fix the period when the Manuscript must have been written:

Kyrie Boeithi ton doulon sou

Cyreon Monachous Presbiterou, &c. &c.

Nota, que je trouve ce Pierre 2. Abbé de l'Abbaye de S. Ambroise de Milan depuis l'an 856 sous Louis 11 (après l'Abbé André 851) jusqu'en l'année 897. C'est la dernière date des Diplomes de l'Abbaye de S. Ambroise de Milan, lesquels commencent en l'année 721 sous le Roi des Lombards Luitprand—dans le "Codice Diplomatico Sant Ambrozio delle Carte dell' Ottavo e Nono Secolo de F. Angelo Fumagalli." Milano, 1805, 4to. [110l. 5s. Marquis of Douglas.]

829 *Officium Beatæ Virginis*, 12mo. A delicate little Book of Offices of the Sixteenth Century, in Roman characters. The Paintings exquisitely finished, the writing admirable, and the border most playfully ornamented in the best style, with devices and mottos of the family for whom it was executed. This is by far the most exquisite of the Italian illuminated offices that Mr. Edwards ever had an opportunity of obtaining; blue morocco, [120l. North.]

830 The celebrated Bedford Missal, or Book of Prayers and Devotional Offices executed for John Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, containing 59 miniature paintings which nearly occupy the whole page, and above a thousand small miniatures of about an inch and a half in diameter displayed in brilliant borders of golden foliage with variegated flowers, &c. at the bottom of every page are two lines in blue and gold letters, to explain the subject of each miniature; a circumstance perhaps only to be found in this expensive performance. But what enhances the value of the MS. in this country, is, that it has preserved

Inquiry into the Causes, &c.

the only portraits remaining of the noble pair who formerly possessed it; John of Lancaster, Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, and Anne of Burgundy, his Duchess, interspersed with their mottos; an elegant expression of the gallantry of that time; on his part "A vous entiers," and on hers, "J'en suis contente." And also the portraits of Henry V. of England, and Catherine of France. Nothing can exceed the strength of character and high finishing of the portraits. Mr. Gough pronounced it the finest example of the art of that period he had ever seen. Vertue engraved his portrait from this painting. Another interesting characteristic in this fine MS. is the attestation of its being presented by gift of the Duchess, and by order of her husband, to King Henry the Sixth, when he went to be crowned in France, and was spending his Christmas at Rouen. The monogram of the attestor F. S. is John Somerset, styling himself *Domini regis ad personam servitor ad sanitatem utraque conservationem consulens*. This is confirmed in Hearne's *Vita Henrici 6*, per T. de Elmham, where he is called physician to the king; and that he was a favourite appears from a grant of the Manor of Ruislip to him for life by Henry 6th. See Lysons's *Engravings*, vol. 5, page 258. This rich book is 11 inches by seven and a half wide, and two and a half thick, bound in crimson velvet, with gold clasps, on which are engraved the arms of Harley, Cavendish, and Hollis, quarterly. It was the property of Edward Lord Harley, Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, who bought it of Lady Worsley, great grand daughter to W. Seymour, second Duke of Somerset, who was appointed Governor to the Prince of Wales by King Charles the First. It descended from Lord Oxford to his daughter, the Duchess of Portland, and was purchased at her sale, May 24, 1786. [687l. 15s. Marquis of Blandford.]

INQUIRY

INTO THE

CAUSES OF THE DIVERSITY OF HUMAN CHARACTER

IN VARIOUS

AGES, NATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS;

By the late PROFESSOR SCOTT, of King's College, Aberdeen.

No. VI.—Continued from No. XX. p. 237.

SECT. III.

Of the Indirect Effects of Climate upon the Human Character.

THE effects of climates which I have yet considered, may be said to proceed immediately from its influence; there are other peculiarities

in the condition of men, which may fairly be traced to the influence of climate, although their dependence upon it is more remote and precarious; and these I am now to consider. They may be contemplated under the heads of first, the condition of the female sex, secondly, manner and amusements, thirdly, laws and government.

First, With respect to the condition of the female sex, we are prepared to admit from what has been detailed at the conclusion of the preceding section, that it has a chance to be more favorable in a temperate than in an intemperate climate. A moderate indulgence of the sexual appetite is much more calculated to advance the respectability of females, than either apathy, or licentiousness in this particular. In hot countries, women have almost always been considered as intended only for sensual enjoyment; they are ardently sought after, but little valued or respected when obtained; and if their persons are admired, their minds are as uniformly despised. In such countries, the inferiority of the females to the males, in every respect, except in personal attractions, is a prevailing doctrine: and in some of them, as is well known, it is even an article of religious faith.

It is in these countries that the practice of polygamy has uniformly prevailed: a practice by which the dignity of the female sex is completely sunk, and women are degraded to the rank of mere slaves. This practice has never been found in the temperate regions of the world, where women have generally been considered as objects of a certain degree of esteem, as well as of desire. The causes of this peculiarity, and its connexion with the influence of climate, have been so admirably pointed out by the celebrated Montesquieu, that I cannot do greater justice to the subject than by transcribing his words.

“ Les femmes sont nubiles, dans les climats chauds, à huit, neuf, et dix ans: ainsi l'enfance et le mariage y vont presque toujours ensemble. Elles sont vieilles à vingt: la raison ne se trouve donc jamais chez elles avec la beauté. Quand la beauté demande l'empire, la raison le fait refuser: quand la raison pourroit l'obtenir, la beauté n'est plus. Les femmes doivent être dans la dépendance: car la raison ne peut leur procurer dans leur vieillesse un empire que la beauté ne leur avoit pas donné dans la jeunesse même. Il est donc très simple qu'un homme, lorsque la religion ne s'y oppose pas, quitte sa femme pour en prendre une autre, et que la polygamie s'introduise.

“ Dans les pays tempérés, où les agrémens des femmes se conservent mieux, où elles sont plus tard nubiles, et où elles ont des enfans dans un âge plus avancé, la vieillesse de leur mari suit en quelque façon la leur: et, comme elles y ont plus de raison et de connoissances quand elles se marient, ne fût-ce que parce qu'elles ont plus longtems vécu, il a dû naturellement s'introduire une espèce d'égalité dans les deux sexes, et par conséquent la loi d'une seule femme.

“ Dans les pays froids, l'usage presque nécessaire des boissons fortes établit l'intemperance parmi les hommes. Les femmes, qui ont à cet égard une retenue naturelle, parce qu'elles ont toujours à se défendre, ont donc encore l'avantage de la raison sur eux.

“La nature, ~~par~~ a distingué les hommes par la force et par la raison, n'a mis à leur pouvoir de terme que celui de cette force et de cette raison. Elle a donné aux femmes les agrémens, et a voulu que leur ascendant finit avec ces agrémens : mais, dans les pays chauds, ils ne se trouvent que dans les commencemens, et jamais dans le cours de leur vie.

“Ainsi la loi qui ne permet qu'une femme se rapporte plus au physique du climat de l'Europe, qu'au physique du climat de l'Asie. C'est une des raisons qui a fait que le Mahométisme a trouvé tant de facilité à s'établir en Asie, et tant de difficulté à s'étendre en Europe ; que le Christianisme s'est maintenu en Europe, et a été détruit en Asie ; et qu'enfin les Mahométans font tant de progrès à la Chine, et les Chrétiens si peu. Les raisons humaines sont toujours subordonnées à cette cause suprême, qui fait tout ce qu'elle veut, et se sert de tout ce qu'elle veut.

“Quelques raisons particulières à Valentinien lui firent permettre la polygamie dans l'empire. Cette loi, violente pour nos climats, fut votée par Theodore, Arcadius, et Honorius.” (*Esprit des loix*, l. 16. ch. 2.)

The reasonings of Montesquien are perfectly agreeable to historical fact. Polygamy has in all ages been practised by the inhabitants of warm climates : and it has as uniformly been rejected by the people of temperate regions. It was the practice of the ancient Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians and Medes ; and it is at this day practised by all the African and Southern Asiatic nations, with scarce any exception. If indeed we can implicitly believe the relations of travellers, there are some exceptions of a very peculiar kind ; for we are informed that in some districts of the East, and particularly in the Ladrone or Marianne islands, a plurality of husbands is allowed to one wife. Montesquien speaks of a similar practice among the Nares upon the coast of Malabar, and indulges in some ingenious reasoning concerning its origin. l. 16. c. 5. A like anomaly prevailed, according to Strabo, in some districts of Media, where, he says, each woman was compelled to receive five husbands, while in other cantons each man was expected to take seven wives. (l. 11.) Such institutions, if ever they existed, are only to be viewed as the exceptions to the generally pervading practice of polygamy, and as occasioned by circumstances altogether peculiar to certain tribes. In the case of the Medes the practice probably arose from the exigencies of war, which while in one quarter of the country it had occasioned an extraordinary havoc among the men, in another might have thinned the women in consequence of the predatory incursions of the enemy.

On the other hand a plurality of wives, or of husbands, seems to have been altogether unknown in more temperate climates. Saxo Grammaticus, who wrote the history of Denmark in the twelfth century, gives no hint of such a practice prevailing, even among the Kings and Princes of his country. Crantz, in his history of the Saxons, affirms that polygamy was never known among the Northern nations of Europe ; which is confirmed by every other writer who

gives the history of any of those nations. Scheffer ⁱⁿ particular, who writes the history of Lapland, observes, that neither polygamy nor divorce were ever heard of in that country, not even during the reign of paganism¹. Christianity has conspired with climate to banish polygamy from most of the countries of modern Europe. But such is the influence of physical causes, that, though Christianity is the religion of Ethiopia, the natives are strongly inclined to indulge in a plurality of wives, nor are the judges severe in their condemnation of that practice. Among the Christians of Congo, polygamy is as much in use as ever it was among Pagans.

We have found the inhabitants of a rigorously cold climate resembling those of torrid regions in many particulars, and it is not a little remarkable that while polygamy appears to have been uniformly discountenanced in the temperate districts of the continent, it has been found in those icy regions where the female sex is extremely little sought after. Polygamy, to this day, it is said, obtains in the cold country of Kamtschatka, and in the still colder country round Hudson's bay.

This singularity can only be ascribed to the little estimation in which females are held in those regions. For polygamy can hardly prevail in countries where women are respected, and on the other hand where it does prevail it is impossible that they can be held in due estimation. Throughout all the East, and in those parts of Africa where polygamy is the practice, women are bought and sold like slaves. "The negroes," says Lord Kames, "purchase their wives and turn them off when they think proper." The same law obtains in China, in Mohomotipa, in the Isthmus of Darien, in Caribbeana, and even in the cold country round Hudson's bay. All the savages of South America, who live near the Oroonoko, purchase as many wives as they can maintain, and divorce them without ceremony. "The sovereign of Gangu, in Africa," says the same author, "has many wives, who are literally his slaves; one carries his bow, one his arrows, and one gives him drink; and while he is drinking, they all fall on their knees, clap their hands, and sing." In the conduct of this petty tyrant we have a faithful picture of the general demeanour of the Asiatics towards their wives.

Jalousy and oppressive restraint are the invariable concomitants of the practice of polygamy. "In the hot countries of Asia," says the author just quoted, "where polygamy is indulged, and wives are purchased for gratifying the carnal appetite merely, it is vain to think of restraining them otherwise than by locks and bars, after having once tasted enjoyment."—"The Chinese," adds he, "are so jealous of their wives, as even to lock them up from their relations; and, so great is their diffidence of the female sex in general, that brothers and sisters are not permitted to converse together. When women go abroad, they are shut up in a close sedan, into which no eye can penetrate. The intrigues carried on by the wives of the Chinese

¹ See Kames's *Sketches* *passim*.

Emperor, and the jealousy that reigns among them, render them unhappy. But luckily, as women are little regarded where polygamy is indulged, their ambition and intrigues give less disturbance to the government, than in the courts of European Princes. The ladies of Hindostan cover their heads with a gauze veil, even at home, which they lay not aside except in company of their nearest relations. A Hindoo buys his wife, and the first time he is permitted to see her without a veil is after marriage, in his own house. In several hot countries, women are put under the guard of eunuchs, as an additional security; and the black eunuchs are commonly preferred for their ugliness. In the city of Moka, in Arabia felix, women of fashion never appear in the streets in day light, but it is a proof of manners refined above those in neighbouring countries, that they are permitted to visit one another in the evening."

Our author next proceeds to illustrate the influence of Eastern manners in corrupting the minds and inflaming the appetites of the female sex. But for what he has said upon that subject, I shall refer to his own work. (*Sketches of the history of Man* b. 1. sk. 6.) It is, however, sufficiently evident that such effects are necessary consequences of the practice of polygamy; and that another practice equally to be reprobated is intimately connected with it; namely, the custom above alluded to of converting men into Eunuchs. This odious refinement of jealous sensuality is found uniformly to accompany the privilege of a plurality of wives. It at once affords a proof that this practice is a violation of the original laws of nature, and shows the futility of the attempts which have been made to defend it upon the erroneous supposition that in the countries where it prevails, the number of females exceeds in a great proportion that of the males.

Let us now contemplate the condition of the female sex in those countries where polygamy never was in practice, and we shall find it much more exalted even during the rudest periods of society. According to the testimony of many ancient writers, the women in the North of Europe were at all times respected by the other sex; they were even held in a certain degree of veneration, as beings of superior wisdom, and consulted as prophets and soothsayers. The Scandinavian women were anciently believed to be skilled in magic, and in the arts of divination, and Procopius informs us, that among the Vandals all the sooth sayers were of the female sex. According to Tacitus, the Germans had no other physicians than their women who were accustomed to follow the armies in order to staunch the blood, and suck the wounds of their husbands, as well as to supply the wants and support the courage of the combatants. Another fact mentioned by that historian places in a very conspicuous light the respect paid to the German women. Female hostages he says, bound the Germans more strictly to their engagement than those of the male sex. for, adds he, they believed that there was something sacred in the female

"Ad matres, ad conjuges, vulnera ferunt nec ille numerus aut existeret si non essent eunuchi et homines, qui in ista sunt."

character; and ascribed to it a superior degree of foresight, inasmuch that they never despised the opinions of women, nor neglected their advice.

As courage was a virtue held in the highest estimation by the rude tribes who anciently inhabited the North of Europe, so it affords a convincing proof of the dignity to which the female sex had attained among those tribes, to find them eminent in the practice of that highly valued qualification. All the writers who treat of those ancient nations concur in ascribing extraordinary fortitude, and even valor to their women. Cæsar, in the first book of his commentaries, describing a battle in which he was engaged with the Helvetii, says that the women, with warlike enthusiasm, exhorted their husbands to persist in the contest, and placed the waggons behind them in a line, to prevent their flight. Tacitus and Florus assert, that several battles of those barbarous nations were renewed by their women presenting their naked bosoms, and declaring their abhorrence of captivity.² Johannes Magnus, Archbishop of Upsal, and Jornandes agree in describing the women of the Goths as full of courage; and trained to arms like the men. The latter makes particular mention of an expedition of the Goths to invade a neighbouring country, in which more women went along with the men than were left at home (b. 1.) The Goths, says Procopius, compelled by famine to surrender to Belisarius the city of Ravenna, were bitterly reproached by their wives for cowardice (Hist. Goth. l. 2.) The Longobard women, according to Paulus Diaconus, when many of their husbands were cut off in a battle, took up arms, and obtained the victory. And Saxo Grammaticus assures us that in former times, many women in Denmark applied themselves to arms.

To this we have to add the various testimonials concerning the remarkable valor of the ancient British women. Tacitus, in his annals, says that the British women frequently joined in battle with the men, when attacked by an enemy. It was not, he says, unusual for that nation to fight under the conduct of a woman.³ Nay, so much was the female sex regarded, that according to the same author there was no distinction observed between it and the male in conferring authority. Of the valor and patriotism of female British chieftains, ancient history affords many notable examples. During the war carried on by Caractacus, against the Romans, Cartimandua Queen of the Brigantes, afforded that gallant Monarch eminent assistance. Bonduca, and Boadicea, are both recorded in Roman annals, as Queens of a warlike and heroic spirit; and both combated their invaders, if not with ultimate success, at least with unshaken bravery.

¹ "Inesse quinetiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant: nec aut consilia eorum aspernantur, aut responsa negliguntur." (De Mor. Germ.)

² "Memorie proditur, quasdam acies inclinatæ jam et labantes a feminis restitutas constantia precum et objectu pectorum, et monstrata cœnibus captivitate quam longe impatientius feminarum suarum nomine timent." Tacitus de mor. Germ.

³ "Solitum quidem Britannis feminarum ductu bellare." (Annal. l. 14.)

"Neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt." (Vit. Agric.)

Neither is it to be imagined from these proofs of manly courage in the females of ancient Britain and Scandinavia, that they were destitute of the peculiar attractions of their sex, or disgustingly harsh and masculine in their demeanour. We have the authority of Procopius, that the women in those countries were remarkable for beauty, and that those of the Goths and Vandals were the finest that ever had been seen in Italy. (Hist. Goth. l. 3.) The literary remains, if they can so be called, of those ancient nations, testify that among them the female sex was the object of a delicate and reverential homage, which could only be due where there was mildness of manners, and propriety of conduct. The ancient poems of Scandinavia contain very refined expressions of love and regard for the female sex. "It is," says Lord Kames, "an additional proof of the great regard paid to women in Scandinavia, that in Edda, the Scandinavian bible, female deities make as great a figure as male deities." If the authenticity of the poems of Ossian be admitted, they afford very singular evidence of the delicate homage paid by the warriors of Caledonia in those remote ages to the fair objects of their affections. But this subject will again come under our notice; and without dwelling farther upon it at present, it may be safely assumed, from the evidence adduced, that among the ancient nations of the North of Europe, females were an object of refined affection, as well as of respect.

Thus, therefore, in regard to the condition of the female sex, we find a decided superiority in the natural influence of a temperate climate over that of a climate either unusually hot or cold. In hot climates, where women arrive at the age of puberty, while their intellectual powers are necessarily dormant, they are sought after merely as the means of sensual gratification; and seldom rise above the condition of slaves. In regions of extreme cold, their condition is little better, as the love of the sex is not sufficient to counterbalance the contempt inspired by inferiority of strength. But in countries which are exempt from either extreme of temperature, the passion for the female sex is compounded of respect and affection, as well as appetite. The women are not considered as mere vehicles of sensual enjoyment, because the growth of their intellectual capacities keeps pace with the ripening of their personal charms. They are admitted as the rational companions of the men; as the sharers in their victories, and the partakers in their power; and as qualified to assist them in counsel and in the field, as well as to sweeten and alleviate their sufferings and toils.

2dly. We have to contemplate the influence of climate, as it affects the manners and amusements of a people; and I cannot help thinking that even in these particulars, which might seem to be very remotely connected with it, the influence of climate is very considerable. As far as we have yet established the operation of climate, we find that in torrid regions its tendency is to produce indolence, and a strong propensity to sensual gratification. In those regions too, the soil is generally fertile; so that abundance of the necessaries, and even many of the superfluities of life, can be obtained with little toil. This circumstance greatly contributes to confirm the indolent tendency of the

people, and by no means counteracts their propensity to sensuality. The effect of the whole together is to produce a fondness for what is called luxury.

There is a considerable difference of opinion concerning the peculiar indulgences in which luxury consists; and the word has no doubt been employed in very different acceptations by different writers; in so much that while with some it conveys a severe imputation, with others it includes scarcely any censure. Without entering into this controversy, I shall merely state that, luxury, according to the meaning in which I here employ it, denotes a fondness for the various indulgences of sense, of the taste, of the eye, of the ear, of the smell, and of the touch, as well as of the sexual appetite; a proneness to indulge in those gratifications in a far greater degree than the simple calls of nature justify, and a consequent dereliction of the more noble purposes for which human nature was intended. Luxury, taken in this sense, is not very different from what is usually called effeminacy.

That it is the natural tendency of a hot climate to promote this kind of luxury and effeminacy, can scarcely be doubted, if we allow to

“Men in different ages,” says Lord Kaimes, “differ widely in their notions of luxury; every new object of sensual gratification, and every indulgence beyond what is usual, are commonly termed *luxury*; and cease to be luxury when they turn habitual. Thus every historian, ancient and modern, while he inveighs against the luxury of his own times, wonders at former historians, for characterising as luxury, what he considers as conveniences merely, or rational improvements. Hear the Roman Historian talking of the war that his countrymen carried on successfully against Antiochus king of Syria: “*Luxuriæ enim peregrinæ origo ab eorum Asiatico invecta in urbem est. Il primum lectos aratos, vestem stragulam pretiosam, plagulas et alia textilia, et quæ tum magnificæ suppellectilis habebantur, monopodia et abacos Romani advexerunt. Tunc psalteria, sambucistruaque, et convivalia ludionum oblectamenta addita epulis. epula quoque ipsæ et curæ et sumptus majore adparari cœptæ: tum coquus, vilissimum antiquis mancipium æstimatione et usu, in pretio esse: et, quod ministerium fuerat ars haberi cœpta. Vix tamen illa, quæ tum conspiciebantur, semina erant futuræ luxuriæ.*” (Tit. Liv. l. 59. c. 6.)

His Lordship relates as a remarkable misapplication of the reproach of luxury or effeminacy, that “a knot of Highlanders laughed, wrapped themselves up in their plaids, and lay down in the snow to sleep. A young gentleman making up a ball of snow, used it for a pillow. His father (Sir Evan Cameron), striking away the ball with his foot, “What, Sir,” says he, “are you turning effeminate?” He is inclined to limit the term luxury to the excessive and habitual indulgence in “the pleasures of taste, touch, and smell, which appear as existing at the organ of sense, and upon that account are held to be merely corporeal:” and he does not think it properly applicable to any pleasure of the eye or ear. But surely, though we should grant that “the concord of sweet sounds,” is an innocent and even dignified indulgence, yet we can hardly exclude from the class of luxuries, splendid ornaments of dress, showy equipages, superb houses, and other “lusts of the eye” which are so much sought after by a wealthy and luxurious people. (See Kaimes’s Sketches, b. 1. sk. 7.)

such a climate, the effects already ascribed to it. Where man is naturally inclined to be idle, and where nature is usually prolific in her gifts, active exertion, whether bodily or mental, will rarely be found. Some expedient must be adopted to fill up the painful void which is thus created, and the pleasures of sense are those which naturally offer themselves for that purpose. Feasting and debauchery effectually occupy the mind and keep off ennui, at least during the moments of immediate enjoyment. Their natural accompaniments are splendid dresses, showy apartments, downy couches, and every resource of art for promoting ornament or ease. Sumptuous equipages, and long retinues of attendants in time succeed; and thus is perfected that luxurious splendor, which we now emphatically call Asiatic or Oriental.

Even in the remotest ages we shall find evidence of a propensity to this kind of enjoyment among the people of the warmer regions of the earth. In the days of the patriarch Abraham, the Asiatic nations are described as possessed of various kinds of jewels, and vessels of gold and silver. In Isaac's time, we find mention of sumptuous and perfumed garments; of which kind were those of Esau, which Rebecca caused Jacob to put on. We find, therefore, the use of perfumes or sweet-smelling odors, introduced among the people of the East, even in the most distant ages; from which we may presume that they were acquainted with other arts of luxury, which Moses had no opportunity of mentioning.

In Egypt we can trace the introduction of luxury also in the most remote ages. In the days of Joseph, we find that the Egyptians were possessed of costly jewels, vessels of gold and silver, rich stuffs and perfumes, and were waited upon by a great number of slaves. This patriarch dwelt in a superb palace, and had a master of the household to manage his domestic affairs. When he went abroad, he had many attendants, and a herald went before the procession, and proclaimed the occasion of it to all the people. At this period the court of Pharaoh makes a very magnificent and brilliant appearance. There we find a chief butler, a chief baker, a captain of the guards, &c. Persons of distinction were then drawn in chariots, of which they had various kinds, suited to a variety of occasions. The establishment of the queens of Egypt must have been very splendid, if we may judge of it from what Diodorus relates, that the whole revenue of the fishing of the lake Mœris was allotted for the purpose of finding those princesses in robes and perfumes. This sum was by no means inconsiderable, for it was said to amount to a talent a-day. (Diod. l. 1. and Athen. l. 1.)

The little we know of the ancient Assyrians proves them to have been not less addicted to luxury than the Egyptians. Their monarchs, from Semiramis down to Sardanapalus, are represented by ancient historians as devoted to sensual indulgence and sunk in effeminacy; and if such were the manners of the court, it is impossible that those of the people could have been very exemplary.

Concerning the ancient Babylonians, we have much more distinct information; and all ancient writers agree in representing them as a

people strongly addicted to luxury and debauchery. The sacred books are full of reproaches uttered by the prophets against this depraved nation. By Daniel they are represented as altogether devoted to gluttony and drunkenness. What we read in this prophet of the feast which Balthasar made for all his court, at the eve of the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, may serve to give us an idea of the excess and licentiousness which reigned in the repasts of the Babylonians. The account given by Quintus Curtius of the manners of the same people agrees in every respect with that of the sacred prophet. It was a practice almost peculiar to the Babylonians of all the nations of the East, to admit women to their banquets, a circumstance which cannot be supposed to have diminished either the luxury or the dissoluteness of the entertainment.

The dress of the Babylonians was extremely sumptuous. Even the common people, according to Herodotus (l. 1. n. 195,) had a tunic of lawn next their skin, which descended to their feet, in the Eastern mode. Above that they wore a woollen robe, and again wrapped themselves in a cloak, which was of an extraordinarily white color. They let their hair grow long, and covered their heads with a kind of bonnet or turban. According to the same author, and Strabo, (l. 16.) each of these people wore a signet on his finger, and never went abroad without having in his hand a staff or baton of elegant workmanship, on the top of which was raised some distinguishing ornament, as a pomegranate, a rose, a lily, or an eagle.

Persons of high rank affected in their dress a much greater degree of magnificence. They were not contented with stuffs of silver and gold, embellished with splendid dyes and the finest embroidery; but enriched them still further, with rubies, emeralds, sapphires, pearls, and all the jewels of the East. Collars of gold were also a part of their finery, as Sextus Empiricus informs us. (l. 3. c. 24.) The Babylonians too greatly delighted in perfumes, of which they made constant use; frequently perfuming the whole body with odoriferous waters. (Herod. ut supra.) The Babylonian perfume was even peculiarly renowned among the nations of antiquity, for the singular excellence of its composition. (Athen. l. 15. c. 13. Plut. in Artox.)

In the decorations of their apartments, as might naturally be expected, the greatest splendor prevailed. The scripture makes mention of vessels of ivory, marble and brass, with which the Babylonian dwellings were adorned; and by the same authority it appears, that many of these implements were ornamented and enriched with precious stones. Costly carpets were an article of luxury in which the Babylonians had attained great excellence. Pliny, speaking of a carpet fit for covering those couches which the ancients made use of at table, says, that this piece of furniture, which was the produce of the looms of Babylon, was valued at eighty one thousand sestertia, or near six hundred pounds sterling. (l. 8. sect. 74.) It appears also from Herodotus, (l. 1. n. 199,) that litters were in general use among the Babylonians, a sort of conveyance which has never been employed but by a voluptuous and effeminate people.

The ancient Medes have been scarcely less exclaimed against for their luxury and effeminacy by the writers of antiquity than the Babylonians. In the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, Strabo, Athenæus, Diodorus, and Justin, we find ample proofs of their passion for pageantry and luxurious indulgence. They wore long flowing robes with large hanging sleeves, a dress well calculated, says Xenophon, to conceal the defects of the shape. These robes were woven with various splendid colors, and richly embroidered with gold and silver. (Herod. l. 1. n. 111. Xenoph. Cyrop. l. 8.) They allowed their hair to grow, and covered their heads with a tiara, or kind of pointed cap of great magnificence. They were besides loaded with bracelets, gold chains, and necklaces adorned with precious stones; (Ib.) and carried their nicety in dress so far as to tinge their eyelids and eyebrows, paint their faces, and mingle artificial with their natural hair. (Xen. Cyrop. l. 1.)

The luxury of the table amongst the Medes was equal to that of their dress. Xenophon describes a feast which Astyages gave to the youthful Cyrus, in which there was the utmost profusion as well in the quantity, as in the variety and quality of the different meats. According to the same authority, excess in wine was an usual accompaniment of such entertainments. (Cyrop. l. 1.) That author also records an instance of this kind of intemperance sufficiently remarkable. In the war which Cyaxares, the last of the Median kings, made against the Babylonians, Cyrus, who had joined his arms to those of that prince, finding a favorable occasion of worsting the enemy, set out on the night at the head of all the cavalry. Cyaxares, on the contrary, passed the same night in a debauch, which he carried to great excess with all his principal officers. (Ut supra.)

Music, amongst the Medes, was called in to heighten the pleasures of the table. They sung and played upon a variety of instruments. The monarchs themselves took part in this diversion, and usually in every thing that could animate the jollity of the feast. Dancing also is to be reckoned among the pleasures of the Medes; and according to Xenophon they gave into it with great ardor and transport. (Cyrop. l. 1. and 4.)

To this detail of the luxurious taste of the ancient Eastern nations, I might add what authors have recorded of the magnificence, pageantry and effeminacy of the Persian court, during the contest of that nation with the Greeks; the pomp and parade of the court of Armenia, during the reign of Tigranes, and so forth: but the description would consist of little other than a repetition of the particulars already stated. It ought also to be mentioned, that the taste for luxury and magnificence was characteristic of these nations only at certain periods of their history; at those namely, when they had acquired dominion over their more feeble and effeminate neighbours; for the Persians and Armenians, properly so called, were naturally a hardy and enterprising race, sprung from a rugged soil, and enjoying a tolerably temperate climate; but like many other nations, they were corrupted by conquest, and contaminated by the effeminate manners of the people over whom they acquired power.

It is equally unnecessary to illustrate the tendency of a sultry climate and fertile soil to encourage luxury and effeminacy, by examples drawn from modern nations. The prevalence of these vices among the present inhabitants of the South and East, among the modern Turks, Persians, Hindoos, Moguls, &c. is too well known to stand in need of proof in this place.

Let us then proceed to contrast this propensity of the inhabitants of warm climates, with what naturally takes place in the temperate regions of the earth. There, in the earlier ages of the world, we hear nothing of elegant and flowing robes, of costly vessels of gold and silver, of magnificent houses and equipages, or of delicious and luxurious repasts. Simplicity in external appearance, and frugality and temperance in living, or at least in eating, seem to have been as characteristic of these people, as the opposite dispositions were of those just described. Let us here, as on former occasions, take for our guide Tacitus, whose philosophical account of the manners of the ancient inhabitants of the North of Europe contains very satisfactory proofs of this remarkable distinction.

"All the Germans," says that author, "cover themselves with a cloak, fastened by a clasp, or sometimes by a thorn only. The rich are distinguished by a vestment, which is not flowing, as those of the Sarmatians and Parthians, but fits closely to their limbs. They likewise wear the skins of beasts, which are more studiously prepared as we recede from the frontiers. These hides they diversify with spots, and with the skins of those creatures which the remotest ocean produces. Neither does the dress of the women differ from that of the men, unless that they sometimes use linen vestments variegated with purple; and that the upper part of their garment is not fashioned into sleeves. Their arms are bare to the shoulders, and the upper part of the breast is uncovered." "There are," says he, "to be seen among them vessels of silver, received as gifts by their ambassadors and princes: but they are employed with as little ceremony, as those of earth." "That the Germans do not inhabit cities," says he, "is sufficiently known. They dwell apart from each other, according as they are attracted by some favorite fountain, field, or grove. They make no use of cement, or of tiles; and in general employ in their houses materials that are rude and inelegant. Some few places they diligently cover with an earth of such purity and splendor, that it produces the effect of a colored painting." "Their food," he says, "is simple, consisting of wild apples, game, milk and cheese; and served without show or any extraneous incitement." What he writes concerning their funereal ceremonies strongly marks the prevailing simplicity of manners. "They are not desirous of funereal honors. The only ceremonial is, that the bodies of illustrious persons are consumed by certain woods. The funeral pile is ornamented neither with garments, nor with perfumes. The arms alone, and sometimes the horse of the deceased, are bestowed upon it. A turf distinguishes the sepulchre. The cumbrous honors of a monument, as displeasing to the departed shade, are uniformly contemned. They soon dismiss cries and lamentation, but long retain a real grief. It is reckoned

becoming in the women to bewail their loss: in the men to remember it only.¹

Such is the contrast that may be traced in the manners of the people of the South and of the North, or more properly in those of the inhabitants of a sultry and of a temperate climate. Among the first a passion for empty show, and the delights of the senses, is found to prevail; the latter are naturally little charmed by external splendor, and are too hardy to place much value on luxurious indulgence. Their pleasures and amusements are usually of a very different class. They are not sought in costly robes, downy couches, or splendid banquets: but in the arduous toils of the chase, in contests of strength or warlike skill, or in listening to the traditionary legends which record the feats and prowess of their ancestors. Tacitus mentions it as a prevailing amusement of the German youth, to expose themselves naked in a dance amidst swords and javelins,² an exercise well calculated to qualify them for the toils of war. How well they encountered the dangers of the fight, we are already qualified to judge, from what our author records of the heroism of the chosen band of the companions to the prince. To this we may add his testimony of the high spirit of honor prevalent among the German soldiers, which rendered it the height of disgrace to relinquish their shield in battle. "Those," says Tacitus, "who met with this misfortune, were disqualified from assisting at the sacred rites or appearing in council, and many of those who ignominiously survived a battle, terminated their shame by a voluntary death."³

¹ "Tegumen omnibus sagum, fibula, aut, si desit, spina consertum. Locupletissimiveste distinguuntur nonfluitante, sicut Sarmatæ ac Parthi, sed stricta et singulos artus exprimente. Gerunt et ferarum pelles proximi ripæ negligentem, ultiores exquisitius, ut quibus nullus per commercia cultus. Eligunt feras, et detracta velamina spargunt maculis, pelibusque beluarum, quas exterior oceanus atque ignotum mare gignit. Nec alius feminis quam viris habitus nisi quod feminæ sæpius lineis amictibus velantur, eosque purpura variant, partemque vestitus superioris in manicis non extendunt, nude brachia ac lacertos. Sed et proxima pars pectoris patet." "Est videre apud illos argentea vasa legatis et principibus eorum muneri data, non in vilitate quàm quæ humo finguntur." "Nullas Germanorum populis urbes habitari satis notum est, ne pati quidem inter se junctas sedes. Colunt discreti ac diversi, ut fons, ut campus, ut nemus placuit. Ne cementorum quidem apud illos aut tegularum usus. Materia ad omnia utuntur informi, et citra speciem aut delectationem. Quædam loca diligentius ædificant terra ita pura ac splendente, ut picturam ac lineamenta colorum imitentur." "Cibi simplices, agrestia poma, recens fera, aut lac concretum. Sine apparatu, sine blandimentis expellunt famem." "Funerum nulla ambitio. Id solum observatur, ut corpora clarorum virorum certis lignis crementur. Struem rogi, nec vestibus, nec odoribus cumulant. Sua cuque arma quorundam igni et equus adjicitur. Sepulchrum respes erigit. Monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem, ut gravem defunctis aspernantur. Lamenta ac lacrymas cito, dolorem et tristitiam tarde ponunt. Feminis lugere honestum est: viris meminisse."

² "Genus spectaculorum unum atque in omni cœtu idem. Nudi juvenes, quibus id ludicrum est, inter gladios se atque infestas frameas saltu faciunt."
³ Scutum reliquisse præcipuum flagitium. Nec aut sacris adesse, aut concilium inire ignominioso fas. Multique superstites bellorum infamiam aqueo finierunt.

There is one kind of sensual indulgence, to which the nations of the north appear to have been more addicted than those of the south, namely intoxication. "The Germans," says Tacitus, "have not the same temperance in drinking as in eating. If one were to indulge their love for liquor to the extent of their desires, they might be conquered not less easily by their vices than by arms."¹ This propensity may be called the vice partly of their climate, partly of their rude and uncivilized state. In countries where the cold is occasionally piercing, as was the case in ancient Germany, the inhabitants are much inclined to indulge in strong liquors; and in such countries this indulgence is not accompanied with the same madness of intoxication nor productive of the same deleterious effects upon the constitution, as in those of a warmer climate. It is likewise universally found that men but a little degree removed from the savage state, are prone to this pernicious indulgence which effectually for a time relieves them from the painful listlessness occasioned by their want of intellectual employment. The habits of the present North American Indians afford a satisfactory commentary upon these observations; and indeed in many particulars bear a very close resemblance to those of the Germans as described by Tacitus. Among them we find the same passion for military glory, the same contempt of danger and even death; the same patient endurance of every privation, with the same occasional tendency to excess. In one important particular however, there was a remarkable distinction. Among the ancient Germans, the female sex was in very high estimation; but among the North American Indians its condition is low, which seems to arise from a frigidity of constitution, natural to those tribes.

The Germans, according to Tacitus, employed for a singular purpose their proneness to convivial excess. They were accustomed during their potations to deliberate concerning peace and war; judging that at no other period was the mind more ardent, or more free from the bias of crooked policy. They took care, however, not to resolve finally till sober reflection returned.² The whole nations of Scandinavia were greatly addicted to excess in liquor; inasmuch that the quaffing endless draughts of beer makes a conspicuous figure among the joys of the immortals as described in the Edda. The Russians of the North are to this day too much addicted to the same vice. But the particulars above detailed of the manners of the Babylonians and other Southern nations, serve to prove that it is a vice by no means confined to the people of the colder regions of the earth.

An amusement of a far more dignified nature in which the ancient Scandinavians and Germans highly delighted was the poetical recital

¹ *Adversus sitim non eadem temperantia. Si indulseris ebrietati suggerendo quantum concupiscunt, haud minus facile vitus quam armis vincuntur.*

² *De pace denique ac bello plerumque in convivis consultant: tanquam nullo magis tempore aut ad simplices cogitationes pateat animus, aut ad magnas incalascit. Ergo docta et multa omnium mens postera die retrahatur, et salva utriusque temporis ratio est. Deliberant, dum fingere nesciunt: constituunt, dum errare non possunt.*

of the heroic deeds of their ancestors. Such recitals, according to Tacitus, inflamed the courage of the Germans, and served them as omens of the fortune of future warfare. Nor was it so much by the charms of harmony as by the display of heroism that the hearers were delighted, for, according to that author, a harshness of tone was affected, and the voice was rendered deeper and more resounding by the application of a shield to the mouth of the bard.* Both Strabo and Diodorus Siculus make mention of the bards of the ancient Gauls, to whom they assign the province of composing songs in praise of deceased heroes. Lucan speaks of this respected class of men in the following terms.

Vos quoque, qui fortes animas, belloque premitas,
I audibus in longum vates dimittitis æcum,
Plurima secum iudicis carmina bardi.

It were easy to multiply evidence of the universal prevalence of this profession among the nations of the north, and the high estimation in which it was held. In ancient chronicles, the kings of Denmark, Sweden and Norway are represented as constantly attended by bards, which were there called Scalds or Scalders, and treated with the highest respect. Harold Haarfager, we are informed, placed these minstrels above all his other officers; and employed them in negotiations of the greatest importance. Hacon earl of Norway, in a celebrated engagement against the warriors of Tomshurg, was attended by five bards, each of whom animated the courage of the soldiers when about to engage, by a war-song. and mention is made by Saxo Grammaticus, in his description of a battle between Woldemar and Sueno, of a scald or bard belonging to the former, who advanced to the front of the army, and in a pathetic strain of poetry, reproached Sueno for the murder of his own father.

The term bard is of British or Celtic origin, and those among the ancient British who were of this profession, formed a distinguished class among the Druids, and employed their strains in order to excite religious enthusiasm, as well as the ardor for military glory. Among the Caledonians, even of the most remote antiquity, we have a singular proof of the high powers of this distinguished order, in the Poems of Ossian, supposing the authenticity of these productions to be established. This most accomplished of all the bards of Celtic antiquity was not less remarkable by the dignity of his birth, than by the sublimity of his genius, since he was the son of that very king of Morven whose exploits he has so exquisitely celebrated. This circumstance is by no means inconsistent with the character of the times, for in

* Sunt illis hæc quoque carmina, quorum relatu quem Barditum vocant, accendunt animos futuræque pugnæ fortunam ipso cantu augurantur, terrent enim, trepidantive, prout sonuit acies. Nec tam vocis ille quam virtutis concentus videtur. Affectatum præcipue asperitas soni et factum murmur objectis ad os scutis, quo plenior et gravior vox repercussu intus miscetur.

many other instances was the ancient character of hard united with elevated rank and warlike fame. Regnar, king of Denmark, was no less distinguished in poetry than in war. Rogwald, earl of Orkney, passed for one of the ablest poets of his day. Harald the valiant, who flourished in the eleventh century, has immortalized himself by a beautiful poem, in which he complains that, notwithstanding his numerous achievements, he is unable to subdue the scorn of a beautiful Russian princess.

Among the Indians of North America, it is a favorite amusement to listen to songs which detail in animated language the warlike exploits of their ancestors. These poetical effusions, however, are not executed by any particular class of men, but are generally left to the seniors, or those who happen to be most versant in such traditional lore. But we have very satisfactory evidence, that among the Greeks, during the heroic ages, the esteem for such martial poetry was so great, that it formed the employment of a separate profession, as among the ancient Scandinavians. Homer makes honorable mention of Thamyris and Tiresias, two celebrated bards of those ages; and he describes as one of the highest gratifications at the court of Alcinoüs the bard Demodocus, pouring forth to the sound of the lyre his lofty strains. It can hardly be considered as degrading to this divine poet himself, to enrol him among a class of men, anciently so highly honored, if, as is justly his due, we place him foremost in the list of all the celebrated bards of antiquity.

Among the people of warmer climates, poetry and music have at all times been sought after as occasional sources of pleasure: but we do not find that they ever attained to that dignified rank, which they evidently possessed among the nations just mentioned. They were considered only as fleeting amusements, calculated to heighten the pleasures of the table, or fill up a vacant hour, but by no means adapted to elevate or invigorate the soul. Hence it does not appear that the profession of poet ever rose to much dignity among the inhabitants of the torrid regions. Like that of a mere musician in modern times, it was encouraged as an occasional luxury, but the talents which it demanded were not considered as of the most honorable kind. It was not deeds of arms, and heroic achievements that formed the favorite subjects of Eastern poetry, but the softer blandishments of love, luxurious and highly-colored description, and the eccentric wanderings of a lively and unchastened imagination.

If such be the character of Asiatic poetry, would a monarch of that country ever have thought of employing one of his minstrels for the purpose, which, according to Homer, Agamemnon intended to effect by a celebrated musician or bard of his time? On setting out for Troy, that prince, if we may credit the poet, in order to secure the fidelity of his queen Clytemnestra, left her under the charge of a bard, whose office it was to regulate her unruly desires by the sound of his lyre. Egysthus, he adds, could not triumph over the virtue of Clytemnestra till he had put to death the minstrel whose strains had

such a salutary effect. (See *Odyss.* l. 3. v. 267, &c.) Whatever there may be in this story, it shows that among the ancient Greeks, poetry and music were not considered as frivolous amusements, but as rational and dignified enjoyments. In confirmation of this, many other facts might easily be adduced, such as Solon promulgating his laws to the sound of his lyre, his quelling a sedition at Athens by the same means; the great efficacy ascribed to the music of Timotheus upon the manners of the Lacedemonians; and various other particulars, which are so generally known, that it would be superfluous to detail them in this place.

This remarkable distinction in the character of the poetry and music of sultry and of temperate climates, seems to have had very extensive effects upon the prevailing amusements and occupations of the people of these different regions. Among the luxurious Asiatic nations, as we have had occasion to remark, the gratifications of the table, the splendor of equipage, ornament and dress were among the principal sources of enjoyment; and poetry and music were only occasionally called in to exhilarate the festive hour, or furnish a new incitement to the pallid appetite. Among the people of more temperate regions, on the contrary, the mind was interested by the exertions of the minstrel; he was listened to with the ardor of enthusiasm, as he poured forth in song the exploits of former ages, and the praise of departed heroes. His maxims were considered as the precepts of experience, and his sentiments as the dictates of virtue. He was not only admired and cherished, but he was also esteemed and honored.

It followed as a natural consequence that among these nations poetry and music gradually rose to a state of high cultivation, as the people emerged from barbarism, and as the various arts became objects of lively interest and curiosity. Among the Greeks, when the useful arts of life were at the lowest ebb, when princes were in the habit of performing for themselves the most menial offices, and when their domestic comforts were not much greater than those now possessed by the meanest peasant, the art of poetry, and as may reasonably be supposed, its twin sister music were in a very high state of improvement. It was during this almost barbarous period, that Homer, the sublimest poetical genius that the world has yet seen, arose; and the era of his immortal compositions adds not a little to the interest which is roused by their intrinsic merit. The poems of Homer carry with them distinct traces of the rudeness of the age in which they were composed; and if there were any doubts of their authenticity, there is sufficient internal evidence to remove all such uncertainty. In these poems we find the liveliest pictures of genuine simplicity of manners, not unmingled with a considerable degree of rudeness and even barbarism; and many of the maxims and sentiments of morality are such as cannot be approved by a more refined age. But we likewise find, along with the sublimest effusions of genius, the language of true heroism, and sentiments admirably adapted to rouse the enthusiasm of a warlike people: occasionally too we meet with the most moving delineations of the softer and more attractive emotions of the human

Inquiry into the Causes of

breast, of compassion for the distressed, of filial piety, and of conjugal affection.

We shall look in vain for such sentiments in the poetical compositions of the luxurious Asiatic nations of the same period; or even of an age of much greater refinement, while in Greece the age of Homer was succeeded by a poetical æra of nearly equal genius, and of much greater correctness of sentiment. That country will always be peculiarly distinguished for having given birth to the drama, an application of the poetic art, which has been productive of very remarkable effects upon the manners of mankind. The origin and progress of dramatic poetry are much better known, than of almost any other art, and the honor of both is almost entirely due to Greece. It was at Athens that Thespis first taught the singers at the festival of Bacchus to intermix with their odes in honor of the divinity, an episodical fable expressive of some interesting event; it was there that Eschylus brought forward his actors completely prepared to represent the characters to which the fable related; and that Sophocles and Euripides brought the Greek tragedy to its most perfect state. The Greek comedy also was invented and perfected in the same city.

The drama we still consider as a school of manners; but at the period of society of which we are treating, its influence in this respect must have been much more considerable. Rude men are much more caught by spectacles than the polished and refined; and the Grecian drama was calculated by the splendor of its decorations, the power of its music, and the sublimity of its poetry, to produce the most impressive effect. We find accordingly that the Greeks had a passionate fondness for theatrical representations, and bestowed much attention upon their regulation. At Athens, commissaries were named by the state, whose office it was to judge of the merit of dramatic pieces: none were allowed to be represented that had not been examined by the commissaries: that which obtained the plurality of suffrages was crowned or declared victorious, and represented at the expense of the republic with all possible pomp and magnificence. (Plut. in Cimone.)

The sentiments in the Greek tragedies are in general calculated to inspire heroism, the love of freedom, ardent patriotism, parental and filial affection, a contempt of danger and even of death, in the cause of our native country, and a pious submission to the will of the Gods. Such too were the prevailing opinions of the people to whom these dramas were addressed. The Greek comedy, along with much appropriate satire on the prevailing absurdities and vices of the age, indulged too much, it must be acknowledged, in personal invective, coarse indelicacy, and looseness of morality. But in its last stage of improvement it became greatly refined of this dross; and constituted on the whole a lively and not uninteresting delineation of human manners. Taking the ancient drama as consisting both of tragedy and comedy, it will be allowed, that it was calculated to produce very happy effects upon a people who were taught to consider it as a source of high enjoyment, and to devote to it their most precious hours of ease and relaxation.

Among the luxurious nations of Asia we find scarce any traces of dramatic poetry, and it does not appear that in that country dramatic exhibitions ever formed a common source of amusement: the prevailing pleasures of these nations were certainly of a less rational and dignified kind; they were directed to the senses and the passions, rather than to the intellect or the imagination; and were more calculated to debase than to elevate the dignity of the human character. The history of the nations of the East is in perfect conformity to these conclusions, for it uniformly exhibits to our view examples of effeminacy, pusillanimity, and sensuality; while that of the European nations of antiquity as uniformly abounds with instances of hardiness, heroism, and magnanimity.

If we inquire into the peculiar manners and amusements of the natives of extremely cold regions, we shall find that, as in former cases, there is a decided advantage in favor of the people of temperate climates; although there is not here the same analogy which we have hitherto found between the effects of climates, which greatly exceed the middle temperature, either by their heat or by their cold. The prevailing characteristic of the inhabitant of the circumpolar regions appears to be apathy and indifference. His passions are torpid; and his desires limited to a provision against the immediate wants of nature. With him, therefore, luxury is a thing utterly unknown. His hut, his dress, and his utensils, are formed with no farther view than to protect him from the rigors of his climate, and to supply his most pressing necessities. And his time is too much taken up in providing for the wants of the moment, or in indulging his propensity to indolence, to allow of his cultivating the elegant arts of life, or of forming a taste for any of the more rational and refined sources of amusement.

There is evidence of a better taste for poetry among some of the Northern tribes, than could well have been expected from their very rude and barbarous condition. Some of the songs of the Laplanders exhibit a refined tenderness, and delicacy of sentiment, which would not discredit a polished nation. Such is particularly the case with two of their love songs, preserved by Scheffer in his history of Lapland, and which have been repeatedly translated into English. The general character of the Laplanders, indeed, stands higher than that of most of the other Arctic or Antarctic tribes. They are a gentle, harmless, and friendly race, strongly attached to one another, and kind and hospitable to strangers. But they are at the same time indolent and timid, destitute of that energy, which provides for the

* The Chinese form an exception to this remark. It appears by the testimony of late travellers, and particularly by the narratives of the recent embassies sent by the British and Dutch East-India Companies, that theatrical exhibitions are a favorite amusement in China, and that the pieces performed have often considerable merit. In Hindostan, Sir William Jones discovered and translated a regular dramatic poem, the *Sacotala*, or *Enchanted Ring*; but it does not appear that the exhibitions of the drama were ever common in that country.

gradual amelioration of the social state, or secures even the most ordinary comforts of life.

It must, therefore, be acknowledged, that the high-flown eulogy of Linnæus, upon the happiness of the Laplanders, is somewhat misplaced.—“O happy Laplander,” says that learned writer, “who, on the utmost verge of habitable earth, livest obscurely, in rest, content, and innocence. Thou darest not the scanty crop, nor the ravages of war, which cannot reach thy shores, while in a single moment they waste and destroy the richest provinces of other countries. Under thy covering of fur, thou sleepest securely, a stranger to care, contention, strife, and envy. Thou hast no danger to fear, but from the thunder of heaven. Thy harmless days slide on in health to extreme old age. Millions of diseases, which ravage the rest of the world, are unknown to thee. Thou livest like a bird in the woods, obliged neither to sow nor to reap, for bounteous Providence has provided for all thy wants.”¹ Such a panegyric, according to Lord Kames, might with more propriety be applied to an oyster—for, says he, “no creature is freer from want, no creature freer from war, and probably no creature is freer from fear; which, alas! is not the case of the Laplander.” (Sketches, b. 2. Sk. 1.)

The manners, pursuits, and amusements, then, congenial to temperate climates, are, in every respect, to be preferred to those natural to climates either of extreme heat or cold. The inhabitant of temperate regions, neither sunk in luxury and effeminacy, like the Asiatic, nor chilled into apathy, like the Greenlander, is fond of active amusement, of the sports of the field, of the recital of the exploits of his ancestors, and of the sublime effusions of genius, in the higher and more instructive species of poetry, music, and song.

3dly. The last of those indirect effects which I conceive climate to produce upon human character, is reducible to the head of laws and government. If climate has a sensible influence upon the strength and vigor of the human constitution; if it perceptibly braces or enervates the tone of the mind; if it gives a character to the ordinary pursuits and amusements of a people, it is a natural conclusion, that it will not be without its effects upon their political institutions, their code of laws, and form of government; for these must be chiefly determined by the general character and dispositions of the people.

If the natives of sultry climates be, as we have represented them,

¹ “O felix Lapo, qui in ultimo angulo mundi sic bene lates, contentus et innocens. Tu nec times abunde caritatem, nec Martis prælia quæ ad tuas oras pervenire nequeunt, sed florentissimas Europæ provincias et urbes, unico momento, sæpe dejiciunt et delent. Tu dormis hic sub tua pelle, ab omnibus curis, contentionibus, rixis, liber, ignorans quid sit invidia. Tu nulla nostri discrimina nisi tonantis Jovis fulmina. Tu ducis innocentissimos tuos annos ultra centenarium numerum, cum facili senectute, et summa sanitate. Te latent myriades morborum nobis Europæis communes. Tu vivis in sylvis, avis instar, nec sementem facis, nec metis; tamen alit te Deus optimus optime.” (Flor. Lappon)

naturally prone to indolence and sensual indulgence, and scarcely susceptible of high intellectual exertion, it is evident that we are not to look among them for the origin of a free political constitution, or the invention of just and equal laws. To obey implicitly the will of another, is but a trifling hardship upon one, whose character is devoid of all energy and activity; who has scarcely a wish beyond those immediate gratifications, with which his prolific soil plentifully supplies him; and who, if he be left in repose, and in the undisturbed enjoyment of the luxuries natural to his climate, has hardly a desire ungratified. Where the necessities, and even conveniences, of life are so easily obtained, they will naturally be considered as comparatively but of little value. If they are taken away by force, the injury will be looked upon as trivial, and consequently will scarcely be provided for by any adequate institutions. Where the circle of enjoyment is confined to a few gratifications of sense, the varieties of injurious treatment are by no means numerous, and do not demand a complicated system of civil or criminal law, in order that they may be sufficiently guarded against.

In the torrid regions, therefore, we are not to expect a complicated system of political regulations, or well digested codes of crimes and punishments. It is not there that we can look for a people jealous of their rights, and anxious to assert their liberties against the usurpations of the powerful and ambitious. We are rather to expect arbitrary government, a deficiency of just and equal laws, the most unfeeling oppression on the part of the rulers, and the most abject submission on the part of those who are subjected to their sway.

If we examine history, we shall find that such has actually been the condition of those regions from the remotest ages. Among the people of Eastern and Southern Asia, despotic government seems to have been nearly coeval with the world itself. In Babylonia, Nimrod laid the foundation of absolute power in the ages immediately after the flood; and from the little we learn of him, we have reason to believe that his sway was tyrannical and oppressive. All the nations spoken of by Moses, the Assyrians, Elamites, the inhabitants of Palestine, and those who dwell on the banks of the Jordan, were without exception under the dominion of kings. In Egypt, too, there was an absolute monarch, and we find by the facts recorded in scripture, that his power was but too often exercised in the oppression of his subjects. Even the Israelites themselves, though favored by the lights of divine inspiration, and originally governed by a code of sacred origin, were unable to resist the general propensity of the people around them, and called loudly for a king to rule over them. The kingly government was accordingly established in their country, and continued ever after to prevail in its most oppressive form.

The most ancient nation of the East, of which profane history takes particular notice, is the Assyrian, and there monarchical government was early established in its utmost rigor. What we learn of Belus, of Ninus, and of Semiramis, is entirely conformable to this assertion. Of Ninias, the successor of Semiramis, the ancient

writers have given several particular details, and they sufficiently establish the tyranny of the kings of Nineveh. This monarch, according to Diodorus and Justin, commanded a certain number of troops to be levied yearly, in every province of his empire. With this army he formed an encampment round his capital, by which means he kept his subjects in obedience, and was always ready to chastise the rebellious. He likewise took especial care to commit the government of his provinces to those who were entirely devoted to his person, and each governor was obliged to repair annually to Nineveh, to give an account of his conduct. (Diod. l. 2. Nic. Damasc.)

It is mentioned by Diodorus, that Ninias kept himself continually secluded within the walls of his palace, (l. 2.) as if apprehensive that the awe with which he wished to inspire his subjects should be diminished by too near an approach to his person. He was not, however, of that effeminate cast, by which his successors in the Assyrian empire were so greatly debased; for it is admitted by the ancient historians, that he took care to place good generals at the head of his armies, experienced governors in his provinces, and able judges in his cities; in a word, that he neglected nothing that seemed necessary to preserve order and tranquillity in his dominions, and that he maintained peace during his whole reign.

In the character of Ninias, then, we behold a despotic, but not a cruel or oppressive prince. It is, however, but seldom that absolute power is untarnished by such excesses. Where there is no restraint upon the will, no check upon the caprices of human nature, the baser passions are but too apt to assume an unbridled sway. The history of the Roman emperors will ever afford a memorable lesson of the dangers of excessive power, and will teach enlightened men to wish to live under a limited authority, as the only safeguard against the most wanton cruelty, and the most unblushing profligacy. We read of a Persian vizier, who, every morning when he left the presence of his sultan, used to satisfy himself whether his head stood firm upon his shoulders. A stronger picture can hardly be exhibited of the abject terror which must ever prevail in a despotic government.

Absolute monarchy has, from the remotest ages to the present times, continued to be the only known form of government throughout the extensive regions of the Southern and Eastern world. In that boundless tract, the inhabitants have, from generation to generation, quietly submitted to the arbitrary will of favored individuals, whom enterprise or accident may have elevated to the seat of power. We read, indeed, of many struggles for the succession of a monarchy; of bloody wars, plots, and assassinations, undertaken by rival candidates for a throne; or by some fortunate conqueror filled with the ambition of universal dominion. But we hear of no contests entered into by the people for the defence of their rights against the encroachments of their rulers, no struggles for equal laws and a free constitution, no steady claims of a strict and incorrupt administration of justice.

It clearly follows from this, that submission to absolute authority is entirely congenial to the people of those regions; and is founded

upon causes as permanent as the soil and climate of the regions themselves. A republic, a democracy, or even an aristocracy, are things which have never been heard of among these nations, and the meaning of which it would be difficult to make them understand. "A Venetian, named Balby," says the French collector of voyages to the Indies, "being at Pegu, was introduced to the king. When his majesty learnt that there was no king at Venice, he burst into such a violent fit of laughter, that he was seized with a cough, and was unable for some time to speak to his courtiers." (T. 3. p. 1.) He was probably as much inclined to disbelief as his brother monarch of Bantam, upon being informed that in winter the waters of the rivers in Europe became so solid, that men could walk upon them.

In countries governed by the absolute will of a despot, it is almost superfluous to inquire what were the laws, or system of jurisprudence; for where all must yield to the mandate of an individual, law is rendered absolutely nugatory. From the little that has descended to us concerning the laws, or rather usages, of the regions now under consideration, we are induced to form a very unfavorable opinion of their spirit. We find them severe and oppressive, deficient in the discrimination of the degrees of guilt, and inflicting the heaviest punishments on every kind of crime. We see in very early times, Thamar condemned to be burnt for adultery (Gen: c. 38.); and in the Egyptian laws we find this punishment inflicted not only for adultery, but for much more venial crimes. Among the Israëlites, blasphemy, idolatry, profanation of the sabbath, smiting or cursing father or mother, were all punished with death, and even with the most cruel kinds of death. Indeed, we find the ancient penal laws of almost every country, uncommonly severe; and it requires the collective wisdom of ages to render the criminal code, even of a free country, at all conformable to the principles of real justice.

The only polished nations of antiquity, who have been celebrated for legislative wisdom, are the Greeks and Romans: for the legal system of the Egyptians, which has sometimes been famed, was rather a religious than a civil code. It was among the Greeks and Romans too, that republican government was first matured, and that full scope was given to the noblest exertions of the human faculties. These were the favored soils in which freedom first fixed her seat; it was in their temperate climate that she first took firm root, and produced those happy fruits which have been found to spring from her alone. It was there that the world first beheld unshaken patriotism, undaunted valor, and the noblest exertions of intellect in all the departments of science and of art.

But it is not from the example of the Greeks and Romans alone that we infer, that temperate climates are favorable to independence of spirit, security of rights, and the administration of just and equal laws. Among our rude forefathers we shall find the same repugnance at despotic government, as among the inhabitants of Latium, of Athens, or of Sparta; we shall even find a free political constitution well organised and digested; and we can discover the distinct embryo of

that admirable system of limited government, which has long been the boast of Britons, and the envy of the world. "C'est d'eux (les Germains)," says Montesquieu, "que les Anglois ont tiré l'idée de leur gouvernement. Ce beau système a été trouvé dans les bois."

The treatise of Tacitus concerning the manners of the Germans amply confirms the truth of this observation. "The Germans," says that writer, "choose their kings, on account of the splendor of their race: their generals, on account of their bravery. But the power of their kings is not unbounded, or arbitrary; and their generals rule rather by example than authority. Affairs of smaller moment are entrusted to the chiefs; but in those of higher consequence, the whole nation deliberates: in such a manner, however, that those matters which depend upon the will of the people, are examined and discussed by the chiefs. If they are not prevented by any emergency, they all convene upon stated days, and generally when the moon changes, or is full. From their unrestricted freedom, this inconvenience arises, that they do not all assemble at once, like men under the influence of command, but sometimes a second or a third day is consumed by the tardiness of those who collect together. They sit down armed, in a promiscuous crowd. The priests command silence; and in them the power of correction is vested. Then the king or principal chief is first heard; and the rest in order, according to their precedence in age, in nobility, in warlike renown, or in eloquence; and their influence arises rather from their ability to persuade, than their authority to command. If the proposed measure displeases, it is rejected by a confused murmur: if it is approved, they brandish their javelins. To assent by arms, is the most honorable species of approbation. In this assembly it is lawful to present accusations, and to prosecute for capital offences. Punishments vary according to the quality of the crime. In the same assembly, also, are chosen their chiefs or rulers, who are to administer justice in the various towns and districts. To each of these are conjoined an hundred persons chosen from the common people, who are to aid them both by their authority and advice."^a

^a "Reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt. Nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas, et duces exemplo potius quam imperio præsent. De minoribus rebus principes consultant, de majoribus omnes; ita tamen ut ea quoque quorum penes plebem arbitrium est, apud principes pertractentur. Coeunt, nisi quid fortuitum et subitum inciderit, certis diebus, cum aut inchoatur luna aut impletur. Illud ex libertate vitium, quod non simul, nec jussi conveniunt, sed et alter et tertius dies cunctatione coeuntium absumitur. Ut turbæ placuit, considunt armati. Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus tum et coercendi jus est, imperatur. Mox rex vel princeps, prout ætas cuique, prout nobilitas, prout decus bellorum, prout facundia est, audiuntur, auctoritate suadendi magis quam jubendi potestate. Si displicuit sententia, fremitu aspernantur: sin placuit, fræneas concutiunt. Honoratissimum assensus genus est armis laudare. Licet apud concilium accusare quoque et discrimen capitis intendere. Distinctio poenarum ex delicto. Eliguntur in eisdem conciliis et principes, qui jura per pagos vicosque reddunt. Centeni singulis ex plebe comites, consilium simul et auctoritas, adsunt." (Tacitus de Mor. Ger.)

What an admirable picture is here displayed of manly independence, and a dignified sense of the rights of the lower orders in the state! We here behold the regulation of public affairs, not entrusted to the arbitrary caprice of a single individual, but subjected to the deliberation of the whole people. We behold a due respect paid to rank, to age, or to talents; but we find no servile adulation, no abject submission. We behold, in a word, that republican system of government, which the political sages of ancient and of modern times have so highly extolled; and which required only to be modelled into the representative form, and guarded by proper checks, to constitute that admirable political system, under which we now happily live.

It is a melancholy reflection to consider how few are the numbers of our fellow creatures, who have at any period enjoyed the blessings of such a form of government. While the fairest and most extensive portion of the habitable world has, from the remotest ages, bowed under the yoke of arbitrary despots, the benefits of freedom and equal laws have been confined to a very limited space, and have been usually enjoyed but for a short interval by the favored people who have at any time possessed them. So congenial, it would seem, is submission, to the greater part of the human race; so difficult is the formation of a well regulated political constitution: and so hard is it to preserve what is thus arduously acquired.

"Il sembleroit," says Montesquieu, "que la nature humaine se souleveroit sans cesse contre le gouvernement despotique. Mais, malgré l'antour des hommes pour la liberté, malgré leur haine contre la violence, la plupart des peuples y sont soumis. Cela est aisé à comprendre. Pour former un gouvernement modéré, il faut combiner les puissances, les régler, les tempérer, les faire agir; donner, pour ainsi dire, un lest à l'une, pour la mettre en état de résister à une autre; c'est un chef d'œuvre de législation, que le hazard fait rarement, et que rarement on laisse faire à la prudence. Un gouvernement despotique, au contraire, saute, pour ainsi dire, aux yeux; il est uniforme partout: comme il ne faut que des passions pour l'établir, tout le monde est bon pour cela." (*L'esprit des loix*, liv. 5. ch. 14.)

It is of little use to enquire what are the laws and form of government which most naturally arise in countries exposed to the extremity of

We find in the laws of the Gothic nations, who overturned the Roman empire, additional evidence of the advance made by the people of the North in the true principles of legislation. The ancient writers pass the highest encomiums on the administration of the Gothic monarchy in Italy, under Theodoric the Great. His laws were dictated by the most enlightened prudence; and framed on that benevolent principle which he expressed in his instructions to the Roman Senate. "*Bravi principis est, non tam delicta velle punire, quam tollere.*" It is enacted by the laws of the Visigoths, who obtained a permanent footing in Spain, that no judge shall decide in any lawsuit, unless he finds a law in the written code applicable to the case. The penal laws of this code are generally tempered with great equity. For example, it is enacted that no punishment can affect the heirs of the criminal: "*Omnia crimina suos sequantur auctores,—et ille solus punitur culpabilis qui culpanda commiserit, et crimen cum illo qui fecerit moriatur.*"

cold. In these torpid regions, the passions are so blunted, and there is so little of intellectual exertion, that laws are scarcely required or thought of. To provide for the bare necessities of life requires a greater effort of industry than the indolent inhabitant of the circumpolar regions is willing to exercise. If this be accomplished, he seeks no further enjoyment than an undisturbed repose amid the smoke of his hut. It is not, therefore, his inclination, either to oppress his fellow-creatures with usurped powers, or to oppose an effectual resistance to the inherited or assumed authority of a chief. Whatever authority is exercised in these inactive regions, is rather of the paternal than the monarchical kind; it is assumed without opposition, and obeyed without repugnance.

In the important prerogatives, then, of laws and government, as in the other particulars that have come under our review, we find that the inhabitants of temperate climates possess superior advantages over the other regions of the earth. It is there only that an equitable system of legislation, and a well regulated political constitution, have usually been found. It is there that the encroachments of despotism have been effectually resisted, and that a permanent provision has been formed for the rights of every order in society, the lowest as well as the highest.

Great, then, indeed, are the privileges which naturally belong to the temperate regions of the earth; for, if the preceding investigations be well founded, we find them excelling those districts which are exposed to the extremes of heat or cold, not only in the natural strength, activity, and temperance of their people; but also in the dignity of the female character, in their habitual manners and amusements, and even in their laws and government.

I shall conclude my observations on this subject with the contrast which Montesquieu has drawn between the inhabitants of temperate and tropical regions. "Il y a, dans l'Europe, une espèce de balancement entre les nations du midi et celles du nord. Les premières ont toutes sortes de commodités pour la vie, et peu de besoins; les secondes ont beaucoup de besoins, et peu de commodités pour la vie. Aux unes, la nature a donné beaucoup, et elles ne lui demandent que peu; aux autres, la nature donne peu, et elles lui demandent beaucoup. L'équilibre se maintient par la paresse qu'elle a donnée aux nations du midi, et par l'industrie et l'activité qu'elle a donnée à celles du nord. Ces dernières sont obligées de travailler beaucoup, sans quoi elles manqueroient de tout, et deviendroient barbares. C'est ce qui a naturalisé la servitude chez les peuples du midi: comme ils peuvent aisément se passer de richesses, ils peuvent encore mieux se passer de liberté. Mais les peuples du nord ont besoin de la liberté, qui leur procure plus de moyens de satisfaire tous les besoins que la nature leur a donnés. Les peuples du nord sont donc dans un état forcé, s'ils ne sont libres ou barbares: presque tous les peuples du midi sont, en quelque façon, dans un état violent, s'ils ne sont esclaves." (*L'esprit des loix*, l. 21. ch. 3.)

BIBLICAL SYNONYMA.

No. IV.—Continued from No. XX. p. 236.

Genesis, viii. 7. *AND he sent forth a raven, which went to and fro, until the waters were dried up from the earth.*

The raven was one of the oldest constellations, and perpetually occurs on all the marbles on which the Mithraic emblems are engraved. It was indeed in most oriental regions a bird sacred to the sun, and of great request in the mysterious rites of their religion. [*Maurice's Ind. Antiq.* vol. 5. p. 617.

Genesis, viii. 8. *And he sent forth a dove from him to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground.*

Lucian, in his book *de deâ Syriâ*, mentions three statues in the most holy recess of the temple at Hieropolis, one of which had a golden dove upon its head, which was supposed to have been intended for Noah, there being a variety of circumstances connected with the worship and rites of that temple, which justified the opinion: this dove, it was asserted, flew away twice in a year, at the time of the commemoration of the flood. It may be added, that the dove was so sacred, that pigeons were never eat about Hieropolis. [*See Cumberland's Sanconiathe*, p. 320.

Genesis, 3. *Eve and the Serpent.*

In the *Codex Vaticanus*, a collection of Mexican paintings, is a representation of the celebrated serpent woman Cihuacohuatl, called also Quilatzli or Tonacacihua, woman of our flesh. The Mexicans consider her as the mother of the human race, and, after the God of the celestial Paradise, Ometeuctli, she held the first rank among the divinities of Anahuac. She is always represented with a great serpent. Behind this serpent, who appears to be speaking to the goddess Cihuacohuatl, are two naked figures of a different color, in the attitude of contending with each other. The serpent woman was considered at Mexico as the mother of two twin-children. These naked figures are perhaps therefore the children of Cihuacohuatl, and remind us, as Humboldt observes, of the Cain and Abel of the scriptures. [*Humboldt's Researches*, vol. 1. p. 195.

Genesis, viii. 21. *And the Lord smelled a sweet savour, &c.*

It seems to have been a general opinion that the deity was gratified by the fumes arising from burnt offerings. Lucian refers to the wound inflicted on Venus by Diomed, *Hom.* 5., adding, that the greatest luxury of the gods was, instead of victuals, to suck in the fumes that rise from the victims, and the blood of sacrifices that are offered to them. [*Lucian Icaro Menippus*, vol. 2. p. 225.

Genesis, xxiii. 16. And Abraham hearkened unto Ephron: and Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant.

This was the most ancient mode of carrying on commerce. There is a curious account in Cosmas (called Indicopleustes) to be found in Maurice's *Ind. Antiq.* of its adoption between the inhabitants of Axuma, the capital of Ethiopia, and the natives of Barbaria, a region of Africa near the sea coast, where were gold mines, which gives us a tolerable idea of this primitive kind of commerce. Every other year a caravan of merchants, to the number of five hundred, sets off from Axuma, to traffic with the Barbarians for gold. They carry with them cattle, salt and iron. On their arrival at the mines, they encamp upon a particular spot, and expose their cattle with the iron and salt to the view of the natives. The Barbarians approach the mart, bringing with them small ingots of gold, and after surveying the articles exposed to sale, place on or near the animal, salt, or iron, they wish to purchase, one or more of the ingots, and then retire to a place at some distance. The proprietor of the article, if he thought the gold sufficient, took it up and went away, and the purchaser also secured and carried away the commodity he desired. If the gold were not deemed sufficient, the Axumite let it remain fixed to the article till either more ingots were added to satisfy the full demand for it, or the first offered taken away. Their total ignorance of each other's language rendered this silent mode necessary, and the whole business terminated in five days, when the Axumite caravan departed homewards, a journey of not less than six months. It was the custom of some Indian merchants, as in fact is still practised in China, to carry a certain portion of gold or silver into the market, and having previously furnished himself with proper instruments and scales, he cut off and weighed out before the vender of the commodity wanted, as many pieces as were proportioned to the purchase of it. [*Maurice, Ind. Antiq.* vol. 7. p. 24. 26.]

Dr. Bell makes the same observation on the Chinese, who, when they have occasion to buy any thing above the value of six pence, cut off a piece of silver and weigh it. [*Bell's Travels*, vol. 2. p. 39.]

Genesis, xxix. 26. And Laban said: It must not be so done in our country to give the younger before the first born.

Thus also in the ancient Hindoo code, it is made criminal for a man to give his younger daughter in marriage before the elder, or for a younger son to marry while his elder brother remains unmarried. [*Maurice, Ind. Ant.* vol. 7. p. 329.]

Genesis, xxxi. 45, 51. And Jacob took a stone and set it up for

■ pillar. *And Laban said to Jacob, Behold this heap, and behold this pillar, which I have cast between me and thee.*

In the treaty of Nerthinsk between the Russians and Chinese, the ambassadors of the latter, according to a custom of the earliest date, raised two pillars upon the spot to determine the boundaries of the respective empires, and on them engraved the treaty. [*Pennant's View of India, &c.* vol. 3. p. 183.

Genesis, xl. 20. And it came to pass, the third, which was Pharaoh's birth-day, that he made a feast unto all his servants.

The following passages, descriptive of the customs of ancient nations, prove the great attention paid to birth-days. Amongst all the Persian festivals, each individual pays particular regard to his birth-day, when they indulge themselves with better fare than usual. The more rich among them prepare on this day an ox, a horse, a camel, or an ass, which are roasted whole: the poorer sort are satisfied with a lamb or a sheep; they eat but sparingly of meat, but are fond of the after dishes, which are separately introduced. [*Herod. Clio.* 133.

There is not a Chinese, though ever so poor, but keeps his birth-day with all the greatness he is able. All the children, kindred, neighbours, and friends, know every man's birth-day; a mandarin's is known by all under his jurisdiction; that of a viceroy or supreme governor by all the province. It is an ancient custom to celebrate birth-days, but not for private persons; nor is it so universal as it is in China. The women keep their birth-days, but the men are never with the women in any rejoicing whatever. [*Fernandez Navarette's Acct. of Spain, Churchill's Coll.* vol. 1. p. 71.

The celebration of the birth-day of the great Mogul is thus described by Sir Thomas Roe. He and all his nobles made merry. I was invited to the ceremony too, and as I drank his health in a noble cup of gold set with emeralds, turquoises, and rubies, he entreated me when I had drunk the wine to accept of the cup as his present. There were several chargers of rubies and almonds made in gold and silver, which were brought in and thrown amongst the nobles and them that stood about him. His majesty appeared in all the height of pomp and richness of dress that day, and his elephants were set out in all their most glorious furniture too: they all passed before him in great order, and bowed very handsomely to him as they marched along, which, all things considered, I thought one of the finest and most agreeable sights that day afforded. [*Harris Coll.* vol. 1. p. 166.

Exodus, ii. 3. And when she could no longer hide him, she took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch, and put the child therein; and she laid it in the flags by the river's brink.

We learn from Strabo, lib. 17., and all antiquity, that boats made of reeds and the Egyptian papyrus were used very early.

Sic cum tenet omnia Nilus

Conseritur bibula Memphytis cymba Papyro. Lucan.

From Lucan also it appears that boats nearly similar were very early in use amongst the Venetians and Britons.

Primum cana salix madefacto vimine parvam

Texitur in puppim caesoque inducta iuvenco

Vectoris patien lunidum supereminet annem:

Sic Venetus stagnante Pado; fusoque Britannus

Navigat oceano.

Pliny mentions some boats used by the Ethiopians, which he calls *Plicatiles*, because, he says, they used to fold them up together, and carry them upon their backs, whenever they came to a cataract; and such, Herodotus tells us, were used by the Babylonians: his words are,—Of all that I saw in this country, next to Babylon itself, what to me appeared the greatest curiosity, were the boats. These, which are used by those who come to the city, are of a circular form and made of skins. They are constructed in the parts above Assyria, where the sides of the vessels, being formed of willow, are covered externally with skins, and having no distinction of head or stern, are modelled into the shape of a shield; lining the bottoms of these boats with reeds, they take on board their merchandize, and thus commit themselves to the stream.

A boat much resembling this is constantly used on the Severn and Wye, called a *coracle*.

The Cahites, a South American tribe, were remarkable for using boats, the fabric of which was something between thatch and wicker work, being of a long and strong kind of straw, knit to the timbers. These they made large enough to carry ten or twelve persons. [*Southey's Brazil*, p. 44.]

Exodus, iii. 5. *And he said: Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.*

This custom is practised by the Siamese when they approach their princes and governors, to whom a deference, amounting nearly to adoration, is paid; an observant traveller mentions it in his audience before the *berklam* or chancellor of Siam: we turned towards the house where he gives public audience, and appears with all his pomp and splendor. We ascended a stony staircase, and then pulled off our shoes. [*Kampher's Japan*, vol. 1. p. 17.]

At Asnere in India, is the tomb of Hodgee Mundeec, the great Indian saint. The sepulchre, with the buildings about it, is a very

noble thing ; it is as rich and fine, as a prodigal, blind zeal and superstition might be supposed to make a thing, for which it expresses the highest respect. You pass three large courts before you come to it, the first of which is near an acre of ground, and is paved with black and white marble ; the others are proportionably large, but the nearer the sepulchre, the more extravagant the pomp and glory of them. There is such an opinion of the sanctity of all these places adjacent to the tomb, that no person dares walk there without a naked foot ; you must be quite bare, or not pretend to tread any part of these hallowed courts. [*Finch's Travels in India, Harris Coll.* vol. 1. p. 89.

In the description of a public triumph in Mexico, the same observance is noticed. "The victories gained were so great, that the rejoicings in Cusco on that score lasted a month. There were of all the several conquered nations there to grace the ceremony, and bear a part in the entertainment ; they all appeared in their several different habits, and with the martial music used in their respective countries ; they were divided into so many distinct bands and troops, which marched in order after the Inca and the generals to the temple of the Sun. All the rest put off their shoes, when they came to the boundaries of the temple, only the Inca himself kept his on till he came to the very door, where he made his feet bare, and then went in, and gave thanks for the mighty victories he had gained." [*Harris Coll.* vol. 1. p. 782.

When Montezuma delivered himself to Cortes, he was accompanied by two hundred lords, drest in a style superior to the other nobles, but bare-footed, two by two, keeping close on each side to the walls of the houses, to show the respect they bore to their sovereign. [*Cullen's Mexico*, vol. 2. p. 64.

And when Cortes with his four captains and a few soldiers went to pay their respects to Montezuma, we are told, that after passing through three courts and some halls to the east antichamber, in order to come at the hall of audience, they were politely received by several lords who kept guard, and were forced to put off their shoes, and to cover their pompous dresses with coarse garments. [*Cullen's Mexico*, vol. 2. p. 70.

Exodus, iv. 15. *And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words into his mouth ; and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.*

Among the Egyptians, says Mr. Bryant,¹ Moses was styled Alpha, or more properly Alphi, which signifies the mouth or oracle of God. We are indebted to Ptolemy Hephestion for this intelligence : his words are, "Moses, the lawgiver of the Hebrews, was called Alpha."

¹ Bryant's Plagues of Egypt, 248.

Exodus, viii. 3. And the river shall bring forth frogs abundantly, which shall go up and come into thine house, and into thy bedchamber, and upon thy bed, and into the house of thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thine ovens, and into thy kneading troughs.

The people called Autariats were forced, by frogs bred in the clouds, which poured down upon them instead of rain, to forsake their country and fly to those parts where now they are settled. [*Diod. Sicul. b. 3. c. 2.*]

Exodus, viii. 17. And Aaron stretched out his hand with his rod, and smote the dust of the earth, and it became lice in man and in beast; all the dust of the land became lice, throughout all the land of Egypt.

In Diodorus Siculus, there is reference to the destructive effects produced by lice upon the body. Talking of the Acridophages, he says, as the manner of their death is strange and wonderful, so it is sad and miserable. For when they grow old, winged lice breed in their flesh not only of diverse sorts, but of horrid and ugly shapes. This plague begins first at the belly and breast, and in a little time eats and consumes the whole body. He that is seized with this distemper first begins to itch a little, as if he had the scab, pleasure and trouble being united. But afterwards, when the lice begin to break out in the skin, abundance of putrid matter, accompanied with intolerable sharp pain, issues out with them. Hereupon the sick person so tears himself in pieces with his nails, that he sobs and groans most lamentably; and while he is thus scratching himself, the lice come pouring out in such abundance, one after another, as out of a vessel full of holes, and thus they close and end his days. [*Diod. Sic. b. 3. c. 2.*]

Exodus, xii. 2. This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you.

The North American Indians begin the year at the first appearance of the first new moon of the vernal equinox. According to the ecclesiastical year of Moses, and the synodical months, each consist of 29 days, 12 hours, and 40 odd minutes, which make the moons alternately to consist of 29 and of 30 days. They pay a great regard to the first appearance of every new moon, and on the occasion always repeat some joyful sounds, and stretch out their hands towards her, but at such times they offer no public sacrifice. The Indians name the various seasons of the year, from the planting or ripening of their fruits; the green-eared moon¹ is the most beloved, when the first fruits become sanctified, by being

¹ The month Abib was, on the institution of the Passover, constituted the first month of the Jewish sacred year; the meaning of Abib is, the green corn.

annually offered up. And from this period they count their beloved or holy things. [*Adair's American Indian*, 76.

Exodus, xxv. 37. *And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof; and they shall light the lamps thereof, that they may give light over against it.*

The idol of Lingam, a deity similar to the Phrallus of the Egyptians, is always to be found in the interior and most sacred part of the temples of Siva. A lamp is kept constantly burning before it, but when the Brahmins perform their religious ceremonies, and make their offerings, which generally consist of flowers, seven lamps are lighted, which De la Croze, speaking from the information of the Protestant missionaries, says, exactly resemble the candelabras of the Jews, that are to be seen in the triumphal arch of Titus. [*Sketches of the Hindoos*, vol. 1. p. 203.

In his account of a bass relief, descriptive of a sacrifice to the Sun, discovered by M. Savary¹ upon a rock near the town of Babran in Egypt, he informs us that before the divine object were three wood piles, sustained by seven vases with handles bearing slain lambs. And M. Montfaucon in his *Antiquities* mentions an image of Mithras, near which were seven altars, flaming to the honor of that deity. It should be observed, that the sun was worshipped by the Persians under the name of Mithras, and by the Phœnicians under the name of Baal.

E. S.

A PASSAGE in CICERO'S CATO MAJOR illustrated.

“Omnino canorum illud in voce splendescit etiam; nescio quo pacto, in senectute.” *Cic. de Senect.* c. 9.

THE only notes upon this passage in J. G. Grævius's excellent edition, published at Amsterdam in 1688. 8vo., are these. “*Canorum illud in voce*—De quo Cic. 3. de Orat. *Est autem in dicendo etiam quidam cantus obscurior, non hic e Phrygia et Caria Rhetorum epilogus, pæne canticum; sed ille, quem significat Demosthenes et Æschines, cum alter alteri objicit vocis flexiones.*” J. G. Grævius. “Quinctilianus, ubi de pronuntiatione agit, dicit vocis naturam spectari quantitate et qualitate. Quantitas est simplicitas; in summa enim grandis, aut exigua est. Qualitas magis varia est: nam est aut candida, aut fusca; et plena, et exilis; et

¹ Savary's Letters, vol. 1. p. 446.

lenis et aspera; et contracta, et fusa; et dura, et flexibilis; et clara, et obtusa. *Canorum* vocem claram; clarior enim tum fit, cum obtusa splendet." Aldus Manutius.

J. C. T. Ernesti, in the *Lex. Technol. Lat. Rhetor.* Lips. 1797. 8vo. p. 46., thus explains *canorum*: "*Vox canora* maxime in virtute ponitur, oratorisque perfecti propria dicitur a rhetoribus, qui et *canorum* oratorem laudant, ubi de præstanti voce et actione sermo est. Sic Cic. Or. 3, 7. in Carbone *profluens* quiddam et *canorum* laudat, quorum illud ad expeditam suavemque orationis copiam, hoc ad concinnitatis eam suavitatem pertinere videtur, quæ cum pronuntiandi modulandique jucunda varietate conjuncta sit. Vid. Brut. 88. et 92. ubi, cum concursus hominum forique strepitus dicantur desiderare *canorum* oratorem, patet magnam vocis claritatem intelligi, quæ nullo strepitu obruatur, sed eum penetret et sua vi superet. Sic Spartianus Pescennium Nigrum ita *canora* vocis fuisse dicit, ut in campo loquens per mille passus audiretur. Enimvero idem Cicero vocem *canoram* (*Offic.* 1. 13. 7.) ita commemorat, ut in vitio esse videatur. Ibi de Catulis, *Sine contentione vox nec languens, nec canora*, ubi pro tinnula accipit Hensingerus, recte quidem, si tantum quendam tremulum cogitavit et firma intentione carentem, ut est apud Quintil. 11. 3. 55. Non dubito illorum verborum eundem sensum esse, qui Cassiodori lib. de *Anima*, ubi describens hominem virtute et sapientia præditum, *vox ipsa*, inquit, *mediocris, nec debilis vicino silentio, nec robusta clamore dilatato*. Quamvis in loco Ciceronis illud etiam vocis vitium cogitari velim, quo ille propter modulationis affectationem, ad mollem quendam cantum accedit. vid. quæ ad voc. *Cantus* diximus. Ceterum in *canoro* veteres non solum præstantiam et splendidam claritatem, sed et suavitatem et elegantiam auribus jucundam cogitasse, patere videtur ex Horat. *Art. Poet.* 321. ubi *nugæ canoræ* dicuntur versus, non rebus ac sententiis, sed solis elocutionis ornamentis, numero, concinnitate etc. excellentes: cf. Cresoll. *Vacat.* Lib. 5. p. 484."

That *canorum* in the passage of Cicero *de Senectute* means, not "magnam vocis claritatem," but "suavitatem et elegantiam," is apparent from the context, and scope of the passage—"Orator metu ne *LANGUESCAT* in senectute; est enim minus ejus non ingenii solum, sed *LATERUM* etiam et *VIRIUM*. Omnino *canorum* illud in voce splendet etiam nescio quo pacto in senectute: quod equidem adhuc non amisi, et videtis annos: sed tamen est *DECORUS SERMO SENIS QUIETUS, ET REMISSUS, facitque persæpe ipsa sibi audientiam disertis senis COMTA ET MITIS ORATIO*."

As to *splendet*, Cicero does not appear any where else to use the verb *splendere* in this sense. Nizolius quotes this passage, and the following from the preface to the *Paradoxa*—"Nihil est tam hominum, tam incultum, quod non *splendet* at oratione, et tan-

quam excolatur." But here it cannot escape the reader's sagacity that the words *splendescat oratione* are not used in the same sense, in which we have "*canorum illud in voce splendescit.*" I have examined the dictionaries of Basil Faber, of J. M. Gesner, and of Ægidius Forcellinus, or Jacobus Facciolati, both under *canorum*, and under *splendescere*, and they have no remarks upon this passage in the *Cato Major*, nor do they cite any similar use of *splendescere* from any other writer. But λαμπρὸς in Greek is applied to the voice, and when it is so applied, it seems always to denote loudness and distinctness.

I find that, in the *Index Demosthenæ Græcitatibus*, Reiske notices these passages, καὶ τὸν βεβιωμένον αὐτῷ βίον αὐτίκα δὴ μάλ' ἔρεϊ λαμπρῇ τῇ φωνῇ: Ἀγαθὴ τίνα δὲ φθέγγεσθαι μέγιστον πάντων, καὶ σαφέστατ' ἂν εἰπεῖν ὅ,τι βούλοιτο, λαμπρῇ τῇ φωνῇ: Αἰσχίνην οἶδ' ὅτι τουτονί. Both occur in the *περὶ παραπρεσβ.* p. 400. l. 16. and p. 405. l. 16. Thus we have in J. C. T. Ernesti's *Lex. Technolog. Gr. Rhetor.* (Lips. 1795. 8vo. p. 194. :) "*Λαμπροφωνία, clara, sonora vox.* Phot. *Bibl. c.* 265. p. 1474. *Oppositum est τὸ ἰσχυρόφωνον.* vid. Plutarch. *Vit. Dec. Rhet. in Isocrate*, cui eodem sensu Philostratus *Soph.* p. 504 τὸ ἑλλυπὲς τοῦ φθέγματος tribuit. vid. voc. λευκός. *Splendorem vocis*, fortasse ex eadem metaphora commemorat Cicero *Brut.* 71. Sic et Plin. l. 20. 6. s. 21. de porro, *Voci splendorem affert.* Cl. Cressoll. *Vac. Ant.* l. 3. p. 482. Polybius l. 1. p. 63. οὐριος καὶ λαμπρὸς ἄνεμος. Georon. l. 12. 15. διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἑτησίας ἀνέμους λαμπροῦς ἐπιπνεῦσαι ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον: ubi J. N. Niclas: "*Λαμπροὶ ἄνεμοι Atticis sunt fortes, magna vi aliquo incumbentes*: vid. Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 114. ac mox hic n. 34. πνευσούσι δὲ καὶ Ἑτησίαί λαμπρῶς, et 38. ἐν τῷ ἔαρι πνεουσὶν ἄνεμοι Ζέφυροι λαμπροί."

But Aristotle *Poet.* 24. uses λαμπρὰ λέξις for *dictio ornata*, as we use *splendid diction*, and the Greek rhetoricians in the same sense use λαμπρὰ νοήματα, λαμπρότης λόγου.

In the sense of *splendid diction* Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 6. de Gregor. Nyss. beautifully says, τὴν φράσιν λαμπρὸς, καὶ ἡδονῆς ὡσὶν ἀποστάζων. It is however to be remarked that Sophocles in the *Oed. Tyr.* 481, ed. Sophoc. Eton. 1736. p. 32. uses the verb as applied to the voice.

ἔλαμψε γὰρ τοῦ νιφόντος

ἄρτίως φανείτα

φάρα Παμφασοῦ.

τὸν ἄξιον ἀνδρα πόντ' ἰχθυέειν.

Here the Scholia substitute ἐδήλωσε as a gloss to explain ἔλαμψε, clumsily enough. But it is here equivalent to *came forth, issued forth, the oracle commanded*, &c. The passages of Pliny and Cicero (in *Bruto*) referred to above by Ernesti, are quoted by

Forcellinus, and decidedly mean "claritas." "*Splendor vocis*," says Forcellinus, "est claritas et canora suavitas. Cic. in *Bruto*, c. 68. et 71. *Actio ejus habebat et in voce magnum splendorem, et in motu summam dignitatem*. Plin. l. 20. c. 6. *Porrum æctivum voci splendorem adfert, καθαίρει τὴν ἀγρηγίαν*, inquit Dioscor. l. ii. c. 179."

But in the passage, which we are discussing, *splendescit* does not mean *claritas*, and this is apparent from the context (as I observed above with respect to *canorum*,) for Cicero indirectly explains his *Canorum illud in voce splendescit* by *sermo quietus et remissus*, and *comta et mitis oratio*, and these words are incompatible with the sense of "claritas" as applied to *canorum*, or to *splendescit*. "Omnino," says he, "*canorum illud in voce splendescit etiam, nescio quo pacto, in senectute; quod equidem adhuc non amisi, et videtis annos: sed tamen est decorus sermo senis quietus et remissus, facitque persæpe ipsa sibi audientiam disertis senis comta et mitis oratio*."

As to *nescio quo pacto*, that implies no doubt of the fact, but merely states that the case is so *somehow or other*, and the phrase *somehow or other* as used by us sometimes implies that we are ignorant of the cause, and sometimes implies simply that we really believe the case to be so, but do not choose to give to ourselves the trouble of thinking how it comes to pass, and in this latter sense I understand the *nescio quo pacto* in the passage under consideration.

The following translation, or paraphrase, of the passage has been proposed: "*Omnino*, 'to speak generally,' *canorum illud*, 'that musical sweetness, which we so much admire in the voice,' *nescio quo pacto*, 'a thing I cannot account for,' *splendescit etiam*, 'becomes even more clear and more dignified,' *in senectute*, in 'old age.'"

From what I have said above the reader will infer that I understand *splendescit* to mean neither "claritas," nor "suavitas," (for "suavitas" is meant by *canorum*,) but Cato means to say that *Canorum illud* 'continues,' 'exists' in old age: *splendescit* is only a strong and vivid expression, and is used simply for *est*, *inest*, *manet*, or some analogous verb, as in the passage of Sophocles quoted above. ἔλαμψε signifies 'the oracle declared, commanded, charged,' or some other analogous idea. The force of the sentence is in *etiam*—*Etiam in senectute*, 'even in old age.' Cato did not mean to say that *canorum illud* is a necessary concomitant of every voice in old age, but that, where this quality of the voice ever exists in *youth*, it

is not NECESSARILY lost in old age, might be supposed, and he seems to intimate that old age rather mellows than destroys it, and he quotes himself as a living example of the truth of the remark—“*Omnino canorum illud splendescit etiam, nescio quo pacto, in senectute; quod equidem adhuc non amisi, et videtis annos.*” But the “principal doubt about the justness of the translation or paraphrase mentioned above arises from hence: that experience does not seem to confirm the truth of Cicero’s observation.” But I have already answered this remark by saying that Cato does not say that ‘old age necessarily mellows the voice, and attunes it to harmony,’ but he intimates that, where there has ever in early life existed anything of a mellow and harmonious voice, it is not necessarily lost in old age, however much the “*latera et vires*” may fail. The misconception appears to be in supposing that Cato meant, to say that this musical property of the voice is its necessary concomitant in old age, which is so far from being true in point of fact, that old age gives to some voices harsh and disagreeable tones; and this, as I suppose, is what is intended by the words that “experience does not confirm the truth of Cicero’s observation.”

Hatton, April 2, 1814.

E. H. BARKER.

ANSWER

To Mr. Bellamy's Essay on the Hebrew Points, and on the Integrity of the Hebrew Text.

No. 111.—Continued from No. XXI. p. 118.

I THINK that we may esteem it very probable, that a MS., written in the Rabbinical character, must, generally speaking, have been transcribed by a Jew: and if this be admitted as a satisfactory evidence of their origin, we shall soon find a great number of our MSS. to be really Jewish; besides many others of which we can ascertain the proper classification by their history.

Another and much stronger proof of the family to which a MS. belongs may be discovered generally, in the date. When the date is given according to the Jewish calculation, it may, I should conceive, be safely referred to the Jewish class. —There is still another

evidence respecting a MS.; namely, the *Masora*. Where the *Masora* is written in the margin, there surely can be no doubt that the copy containing it is a genuine copy: and this will go far to prove the authenticity of most of the MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott. It is a curious fact that his Cod. 28., which has a double Latin version, and the Lord's prayer, twice written in Hebrew at the end, and which there is reason to believe was transcribed by some Christian, or, perhaps, some converted Jew, has neither date nor *Masora*.

I have not insisted upon the Codices Hebræo-Latini, because it is not exactly known what they really are: that the greater part of Dr. Kennicott's collection, however, are genuine copies, there cannot be a moment's doubt. Many of them carry with them a certificate of their birth. For example, Cod. 76. "scriptus fuit a Rabbi Menahim in usum Rab. שלמה יעקב בן הקדוש" ex *Grenoble*, in civitate *S. Arnould*, A. M. 5056.—A. C. 1296.¹ In Cod. 89, "constat Colophon lineis 14. scriptis *rythmicè*; et lineæ 8. ultimæ dant *acrosticè* nomen scribæ יעקב הלוי qui codicem vel punctavit, vel perfecit."²—There is one MS. more to which I shall particularly call the reader's attention; Dr. Kennicott's Cod. 99., of which he gives the following account: "parum adest *Masora*. Libri 3 poetici scribuntur hemistichè; at, ordine forsan singulari, exaratur *Ruth* inter *Psalms* et *Jobum*. Codex noster, etsi non inter antiquos numerandus, argutias *Masoreticas* de literis minusculis, &c. (Gen. ii. 4.; xxiii. 2. &c.) sapientius corrigit; et plurimas voces abnormes emendat: ut bis in Gen. xviii. 24. הצדיקים et צדיקים. Dicitur in fine, codicem scriptum esse a Jacobo ben Rab. Josephi de Riphullo, pro R. Isaaco ben R. Juda de Tholosa, hinc *Salsona*, an. mundi 5145: i. e. an. Christi 1385. Hæc descriptio nunc paginarum exornat titularem; et hac paginâ aversâ, legitur codicis hujus *historia*, a testibus 5 comprobata. Affirmat Titulus—*Codicem hunc esse sanctissimæ Hierosolymorum civitatis Synagogæ dicatum et consecratum*. Affirmat insuper *historia*—quod *Turca*, deprædatâ *Synagogâ Jerusalem*, eo quod infelix natio *Judeorum* argentum sibi impositum exsolvere potis haudquaquam fuerat, sacrum hunc librum eo majori abstulerunt aviditate, quo majori cupiditate *Judæi* retinere conabantur, uti pretiosissimam *Thesauri sui supellectilem*."³ 1. Dr. Kennicott's catalogue there are a great number of Jewish copies, which I now enumerate. They are numbered as follows: 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 387, 388, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 522, 523, 524, 546, 547, 554. (belonging to the public library of the Jews at *Mantua* :)

¹ Dissert. Gen. p. 77.² Ibid. p. 79.³ Ibid. pp. 79—80.

556, 558, 561, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 668. (belongs to the Chinese Jews :) 671. A. B. C. D. E. (five rolls, each containing the Pentateuch, belonging to the Synagogue in Duke's Place :) 672. A. B. C. (three rolls, each containing the Pentateuch, belonging to the Synagogue at Bevis Marks.) Fourteen of these, viz. 377, 379, 423, 425, 428, 546, 570, 571, 574, 636, 637, 638, 639, 642. read חסידך Ps. xvi. 10: to these must be added 2. and 99? five only read הסיידך; viz. 409, 410, 523, 572, 579: 575 was not collated in the Psalms; and the other MSS. mentioned, do not contain the Psalms.—Out of 272 copies collated either in whole or in part, 180 have חסידך in the text; among these authorities is the Talmud of Babylon, which twice quotes Ps. xvi. 10. and in both citations, * in all the editions reads חסידך: and also the Keri printed in Vander-Hooght's Bible: 664 should be reckoned as more than one authority, because it consists entirely of variations quoted by Houbigant “*ex codicibus non descriptis*.” חסידך was originally the reading of three copies, which have since been altered, and is now the marginal reading of four authorities.

This, I think, affords strong evidence, that Jewish, and therefore genuine, copies still exist; and it is equally true that these copies by no means agree among themselves.—Hence, therefore, Mr. B.'s assertion, that, on examining “the authorised copies in use among the Jews, which have been handed down to them from the time of their dispersion,” we shall “find that they all agree; there are no different readings, consequently they must be the same as the autograph of Moses,”³ evidently is incorrect: and thus both his principal reasons for believing in the integrity of the Hebrew text fall together.

It is also true that the Rabbinical writings frequently supply us with various readings.—Let us compare a few citations from G50. B. (the Babylonish Talmud,) with the text of Vander-Hooght.

Vander-Hooght's edit.

Talmud.

Ps. xv. 1. כִּי

וְכִי

xvi. 10. לֹא תִתֵּן

לֹא תִתֵּן

חֲסִידְךָ

חֲסִידְךָ

¹ “De Codice 502. agit in Dissertatione MS^a Jacob Saraval, doctus Judæus Mantuanus; qui disertis verbis ait, *Varietatem lectionis, in MS^o. magno numero reperiendam, ex consensu, cum antiquis versionibus dyjudicandam esse.*” Kennicott Dissert. Gen. p. 105.

² Talmud. Bab. T. ii. tract. *Erubin*. fol. 19. Tom. iii. tract. *Gom.* fol. 87.

³ *Class. Journ.* No. xviii. p. 407.

Vander-Hooght's Edit.

Talmud.

Ps. xvi. 11. את

omitted; all other authorities retain it.

xvii. 14. וצפניך

וצפונך

xxiv. 6. דרשו

דורשו

xxxi. 6. פדיתה

פדית with many other authorities.

xxxv. 15. ולא ידעתי

omitted.

xxxix. 13. first אל

ואל

xliv. 10. אף זנה ותבלימו אלף וזנה ותבלימו

אלף וזנה ותבלימו

— 24. אל

650 H. (Jerusalem Talmud)

xlvii. 7. אלהים

650 B. alone

— 8. כל

many other authorities.

xlix. 15. וצידם

many authorities.

li. 6. בשפתך

בשפתך

lxv. 11. תלמיה

650 H. תלמי

— — נדונה

many authorities. נדונה

lxxiii. 13. מלכי

מלאכי

lxxii. 17. ינן

ינן

— 18. עשה

עשה

— — נפלאות

נפלאות גדולות

lxxiv. 4. מועדך

מועדך

— 11. חוקך

חוקך

On the subject of the Talmudic readings, I shall only further produce the opinion of Dr. Gill, by whom they were examined. He had formerly said that the Talmudical variations were few in number, but after having collated them he changed his opinion and confessed his mistake. "*Jam retractandum erit, quod egomet ipse affirmavi, et alii ante me, 'nimium, vel nullas vel perpaucas reperiri varietates a textu vulgato, in Talmude hinc illuc allegatis; et hasce nullius, saltem levis esse momenti: quum constet ex præcedenti collatione, discrepantias esse tantum non mille.*"

It is certain, also, that various readings were occasionally collected by the Jews themselves. *Rabbi Ben Chaim*, in the preface to the great Rabbinical Bible printed at Venice by Bomberg, has these words: "*Viri Synagogæ magnæ invenerunt libros inter*

se diffire. et in loco, ubi invenerunt dubitationem et confusionem, adscribebant unum, sed non punctabant; vel adscribebant margini, sed non in textu, quia fuerunt dubii de eo quod invenerunt."¹

Sed missa hac faciamus

We rest the argument on other grounds — The text of the New Testament certainly is far removed from a state of absolute integrity or perfection. To go no farther, we have a most convincing proof of this in the case of the controverted verse, 1 John v. 7. It is not my intention to enter again into the merits of that question, but I may remark, that, whichever side of the question be true, still a corruption must somewhere exist. If the text be genuine, it must follow that all the MSS. and versions must be corrupted, because in those it is omitted. If it be spurious, the printed editions must be interpolated, because in them it is contained. From one of these inferences there is no possible way of escaping: and then a second inquiry is to be made, why should either the MS. or the printed text be permitted to be corrupted either by omission or addition? Neither does the question stop here. Both the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are undoubtedly sacred, and having been both "given by inspiration of God, are equally entitled to his miraculous and divine protection. How happens it, then, that they are not both placed upon the same footing? Why should one be committed to the care of Man, while the other is retained under the more immediate guard of Heaven? Why should that protection be withheld from the Scriptures of the Christian, that is so liberally granted to those of the Mosiac covenant? and why should God have so visibly watched over the revelation of his inspired prophet, while he seems not to have guarded the gospel of his Son?

These are all obvious and fair questions. nor is the answer to them very easy, while we defend the integrity of the Hebrew text: when we yield that, every thing becomes easy, all difficulties vanish, and all inconsistencies disappear. Nor need we fear that we thus open too wide a door to infidelity: the *doctrinal* integrity of the text will still remain, though the *literal* integrity may be untenable. It is merely the doctrinal integrity of which we stand in need: if we show, as we certainly can do, that with regard to doctrine, the text is precisely in the same state as when delivered by Moses or by Christ, we still have sufficient ground on which to prove the divine origin of our faith. All genuine parts of Scripture are retained in a number of copies fully sufficient to prove them so: and when a passage is destitute of such support, it does not become unreasonable to consider it as spurious. Nor can the rejection of a passage ever militate against the doctrine it

¹ Rab. Ben Chaim in Pr. it. 4p. Kennicott *Dissert. Gen.* p. 10

contains; for the wisdom of the Almighty has ever ordained that no doctrine essential to salvation should ever rest upon a single passage. Even if 1 John v. 7. be spurious, the doctrine of the Trinity remains undiminished in strength; because it is unequivocally declared in so many Texts, and may be logically deduced from so many more, that the addition or omission of the passage will make as little difference in the Trinitarian controversy, as would a single drop of water, taken from, or added to, the waves of the ocean.

For my own part, I may be permitted to say, that I regard the corruption of the text as one of the strongest arguments for the truth and divine inspiration of the Scriptures. This may, at the first view, seem a paradox; but it appears on a second and more deliberate examination to be founded in fair reasoning. It is apparently conceded on both sides, that, whatever may be the state of the Hebrew Text in a literal point of view, it is certainly entirely pure as far as relates to matters of faith, and instructions in morality: if then, it be still perfect in this sense, while it is corrupt in the other, it will surely follow, that by some providential care the doctrine has been preserved, while the other parts have remained in the care of men: and it will easily be granted that this care would not have been extended to it had it been an unhallowed imposition on the world.

It is now high time that I should conclude: but before I close my letter, I request Mr. B. to believe that I entertain a sincere respect for the rectitude of his intentions, and that on the main point, the truth and divine authority of the Bible, I cordially agree with him: and should it be attacked, he will find many abler assistants in defending it, but can never have a more zealous and sincere coadjutor. How far I have succeeded in defending Dr. Kennicott's side of the question must be left to your judgment and that of your readers: but that the integrity of the text must be proved by other arguments than those which Mr. B. has made use of, seems very plain. Had it been probable that any others of your correspondents would have taken the trouble to address you upon Mr. B.'s article, you would not have been troubled with these remarks. "*Quemvis—hoc malleme de iis, qui essent idonei, suscipere, quam me; me, ut inllem, quam neminem.*" [*Cicero, Orat. in Q. Cæcilium. s. 5.*]

Aug. 12, 1814.

M.

P. S. I wish to add a few particulars respecting a Masoretical edition to which I have already alluded; but which it would then have been foreign to my purpose particularly to mention. This edition is denoted in Kennicott's work, by 300. It was printed at Mantua, 1742—1744, and is generally known by the name

כִּנְחַת שׁ: and although the text for the most part agrees with that of the other editions, “comprehendit—varias lectiones supra 2000, corrogatas ex MStis et editt. impressis, a Judæo eruditissimo, nomine *Jedidiah Solomon, Menorzi* seu ex familiâ *Norzi*.” *Dissert. Gen. p. 27*. In the preface a pathetic account is given of the difficulties under which the Jews at present labor; “nec minima datur luctus hujus causa, quod sacri eorum libri multâ adhuc egeant emendatione, quam tamen facile nancisci non possint.” *Dissert. Gen. p. 27*.—“desolatus est omnis pius et consternatus; dum intelligit, quod abierit manus, et ERRORES MULTIPLICATI SINT. nec est cuiquam curæ cordique, ut citò afferat medicamenta. Quis restituet decus? — Quis collocabit nobis signa in literis? Quis ejiciet raphanos et spinas? Quis dubit ut conscribantur voces et signantur, secundum emendationem in libris perfectis?”¹ There are also many parts in which the multitude of various readings greatly perplexes the author: he remarks on Prov. vii. 25. in the following manner: “Erravit cor meum, horror confudit me; quum viderem multitudinem variantium, quæ ceciderunt in libros! Omnes nos tanquam oves erramus; quilibet ad viam suam respicit: neque est qui docet cognitionem, et judicat secundum normam. Is. liv. 1. Ego autem sedeo desolatus; quum video multitudinem diversitatum, quæ ceciderunt in libros: et valde malum hoc mihi factum videtur. Quia singulis diebus continuantur, et multiplicantur; et editores eunt obscurati, neque lux est eis: nequè est qui indagat, neque est qui quærit cessationem hujus diversitatis!” On Zach. xi. 5. he has the following note: “Diversitates multas vidi in aliis libris, et harum tædium me cepit: quare abscondidi faciem meam ab illis.” He goes still farther in a note on 2 Kings xviii. 29.: “Libri, in quibus scriptum בִּירִי, sequuntur filios Babylonis; sed secundum filios terræ Israelis (quibus nos innititur in varietatibus Bibliorum) scribitur כִּירִי. Quis potest emendare quod PERVERTERUNT SCRIBÆ, et TYPOGRAPHI, a DIEBUS ANTIQUIS?—Ecce nos palpantes tanquam cæci in obscuritate diversitatum; nec prosperam facimus viam nostram, ad inveniendum desiderium nostrum. In tribus libris antiquis impressis sic, בִּירִי sicut inveni in uno correcto MSto Hispanico: at in alio MSto כִּירִי cujus tamen in margine notatur, alia exemplaria habere בִּירִי.—Non est in potestate meâ decidere. Deus auferat tenebras nostras; ut oculi cæcorum, caligine et tenebris obducti, videant.”²—In quoting the notes of this edition, Dr. K. marks them by 300: when he cites the text, he makes use of the mark 300. T. Let us now extract a few of the principal readings of this edition, and occasionally compare them with other Jewish copies.

¹ J. S. Menorzi in Prefat. ad כִּנְחַת שׁ ap. Kennicott. *Dissert. Gen. p. 27*.

² Ibid.

84 *Different Latin Poetical Expressions*

Text of Vander Hooght.	Cod. 300.	Readings of other Copies.
Ps. i. 1. ובמשב	ובמושב	T. 2 99.
v. 6 כל שנאת		כל ששנאת 650 H.
— 8. ביתך	ביתך	
vii. 5. שלמי	שולמי	T. 2. 99.
viii. 3. וינקים	וינקים	99.
ix. 1. על מות	עלמות	
— 12. הגדו	הגדו	T. 2. 99.
x. 5. דרכו	דרכו	2. 99. 650 B.
— 9. לחטוף	לחטף	2. 99. .
xi. 1. נדדו		נודי 650 B.
xv. 1. ידה		omitted in 650 B.
— מי	ומי	650 B.
xvi. 10. לא		ולא 2. 650 B.
— חסידך		חסידך 2. 99. 650 B. with many others.
xvii. 5. אשרי	אשורי	2.
— 14. וצפינך		וצפונך 650 B.

It is but fair to acknowledge that the edition in question appears to be more unprolific in various readings in the Psalms, than in the other parts of Scripture: but I select the early Psalms chiefly for the sake of giving more of the Talmudical readings, than I could do in the body of my letter.

On the different LATIN POETICAL expressions to render the ENGLISH verb TO RUN.

It is well known that some of the greatest poets have been in the habit of writing their verses in several different ways, before they could express themselves in such a manner as to meet with their own approbation. The rough copy of Pope's Homer, now deposited in the British Museum, affords an unequivocal proof of this circumstance. Virgil is reported to have sometimes written a great number of verses, which, on correction, he afterwards reduced to few; but this may perhaps mean nothing more than the different forms of expressing the same ideas, from which he particularly selected those which appeared to be the most felicitous, appropriate, and elegant. His poems afford internal evidence of unwearied labor and application. They are the most correct, and the most

artificial, perhaps, in any language, and exclusively of the matter which I am not now to consider, the perfection of the numbers is such, that they never could have been the extemporaneous and unrevised effusions of even the highest and most extraordinary gifts of the human intellect. I appeal to any scholar of taste, if on reading Virgil for the hundredth time, he will not still discover something new; some of those very minute and critical points both in the matter and the style, which will then excite his admiration. I have also seen some variations of the Italian poems of Petrarch, in which many of the lines seem to have been originally expressed in several different ways. The versification of that poet ranks as high in Italian, as that of Virgil in Latin. Their numbers are indeed the standards of perfection in their respective languages, a characteristic for which those poets were undoubtedly indebted to their taste, their accuracy, their skill, and their application. Indeed I believe that if we could trace the private literary history of every other poet, we should find his case to have been the same, and that his most beautiful passages were precisely those which he had re-written the oftenest, and which had cost him the most pains in revision.

The poetical spirit of ideas is the exclusive gift of nature, and therefore unattainable by art; but the excellence of metrical combinations is the result of skill and copiousness of diction. Hence poets have generally chosen that particular language, in which they could most easily, and most fully, express their own sentiments. The copiousness of every dialect is not, however, the same, and there are sometimes defects against which neither art nor genius can afford an adequate remedy. But the Latin, from which I am going to give an instance, does not labor under any such disadvantages. Its copiousness is immense, and a real scholar can never be at a loss in it for suitable expressions. I am an enthusiastic admirer of the Roman muse, but I trust that it is an attachment founded on her intrinsic merit. I had lately occasion to turn the following English words into a Latin distich—*A spirited horse runs*. Of course the thought consists of three distinct ideas,—*horse—spirited—and running*.

Insigni captus meritæ dulcedine palmæ |

En! festinat ovans | pulverulentus equus.

I was not pleased with the way in which, at first, I versified the last idea, and which is included in the first hemistich of the second line. I tried again, I was not satisfied, and I made the hemistich a third time.

My theory is, that the poet should go on versifying the same thing over again, until he has produced something good; and hence a thought struck me to make an experiment on the copiousness of poetical Latin expressions, and to ascertain in how many various

ways the action of running might be described in the first penthemimer, without altering the former versé, or the conclusion of the distich. Great and extensive as are the resources of Latin phraseology, I was astonished at the result. My success exceeded my most sanguine expectations, and it filled me with admiration, that without seeking for any uncommon expressions, exerting any particular labor, or even materially departing from the meaning of *to run*, I found that in about an hour I had translated it in poetical Latin, in nearly forty different ways. Encouraged by this unexpected success, I have since seriously endeavoured to carry it on still further, and I have now to offer considerably above *one hundred* variations of the same meaning. The subject, however, is not exhausted, and such is the superabundance of the Latin idiom, that it is impossible to say to what an extent the expression might not be still modified.

It is an indispensable qualification to become a good Latin poet, to be an elegant scholar, and a man of genius; and it is, therefore, an accomplishment which can be possessed but by few. But this great variety of diction, while it perplexes and even misleads the unlearned, affords an incalculable assistance to the skilful versifier. What cannot come into metre in one way, will come in another. The facility, which in a few instances has been acquired in writing Latin verse, is amazing, and there have been persons who could compose in it nearly as fast as they could have done in Latin prose. Such a facility is the necessary consequence of having a great variety of expressions at command; and hence it has been generally acknowledged, that supposing an equal skill in English and Latin versification, that of the former is the more difficult.

Vida observes that the poverty of the Latin language, of which Lucretius complained, had long ceased to exist. I am doubtful whether any other language could be found, in which the same idea could be expressed under so many different forms. In Greek, on account of its copiousness, it might perhaps be done. As to French, it is the most unpoetical of all languages. I do not believe that there is so much variety in English or in Italian; and if I am not mistaken, there is not either in Spanish or Portuguese.

The variations which I am going to offer, only affect the former part of the second line, in which, for the connexion of the sense, the use of a verb is indispensable, together with some other word depending upon it, so as to fill up the hemistich. If it were not for this circumstance, the variations might be still more diversified. There is no doubt also that the whole couplet might be as much varied in its composition, as the hemistich in question.

The difficulty which is so often experienced in composing Latin verse does not really exist in the thing itself, but in the incapacity of the versifier. Since this is, therefore, the natural inference, it is

not less so on the contrary, that the facility of Latin verse affords a most ample encouragement for the exertions of the poet in that language. He ought to persevere in making the same verse over again, until he has been particularly fortunate in the structure of it; and he ought also never to overlook one single careless, inelegant, vulgar or inappropriate expression.

This great variety has also the advantage of enabling persons who have but a moderate acquaintance with Latin, to frame tolerable verses with the assistance of the *Gradus*. If they know but the common rules of metre, and can remember only a few of those numberless expressions, they will be able to make them scald together into verse,—and that will be sufficient. The greater number of Latin verses at this time, (though by the way not the best) are those done in schools, sometimes under very indifferent masters, and that too only with a view to acquire a knowledge of Latin quantity. Considering it, however, as a more scholarlike and more elegant exercise, I would suggest that instead of requiring young persons to bring a certain number of verses, they should be encouraged to exhibit the same thought so many times versified, under a different form and inflection. This would introduce them to a more intimate acquaintance with the language, by compelling them to think more on their subject, and to take in a wider range of expression.

Something of the kind, though in a very imperfect degree, obtains in some seminaries, where the odes of Horace are given as exercises, to be turned into elegiac verse.

It is, however, unnecessary to give directions, where nature has denied the existence of poetical powers, or where a want of taste does not permit them to be called into action. Nor is that alone sufficient. The poet must not be in a state of uncertainty about his daily subsistence: he must have leisure, and he must be free from all the cruel anxieties of the mind, before he can acquire that total abstraction, which is necessary for the cultivation of his favorite pursuit. Some of the latter poems of Ovid have been severely criticised, as if they betrayed evident marks of carelessness, and as if his intellectual powers had been sinking fast into decay: I am so far from agreeing in this opinion, that I consider the *Tristia* as one of the proudest monuments of human genius. Those elegies, I own, might perhaps in several passages have been more correct, but taken all together, they still exhibit the wrecks of a mighty mind, which it had not been in the power of misfortune and persecution to overwhelm, and which appears venerable, like a ruined edifice, which still raises its bold front, as if to attest at once the fury and the impotence of the pitiless storm. It is rather astonishing that the Roman poet, when placed in such circumstances, should have been able to write at all, and that that vigor of mind which was

only impaired, should not have been totally extinguished by despair and insanity. The *Tristia* were composed by the poet with the view of softening, since he could not forget, the recollections of an accumulation of calamities—the loss of his home, his fortune, and his friends—those friends whom he complains to have basely forsaken him by joining in the cry of persecution, and by trampling upon him in the hour of his distress. Still like what is reported of the palm tree, he rose superior to the pressure which would have crushed him to the ground; and his celebrity has survived, when the names of his oppressors are either forgotten, or only remembered in execration.

This is the summary of my reasons for admiring the *Tristia*; the very same reasons in substance which the poet himself repeatedly employs to excuse the inaccuracies of that work. It is, therefore, indispensably necessary, that whoever wishes to cultivate poetry, should not only be entirely absorbed in that most delightful of all studies, but that his own mind should be free from every kind of anxiety; for the contrary instance of Ovid is more to be considered as a singular and uncommon exception, or rather moral phenomenon, than to be expected to be found in every individual, who is similarly situated.

Insigni captus meritæ dulcedine palmæ, (*Spirited*)

En! festinat ovens (*Runs*) pulverulentus equus (*Horse.*)

Varia lectiones.

Hinnit ut excurrit pulverulentus equus.—Per campos fertur p. e.—Currit rura super p. e.—It per strata viæ p. e.—Fert per rura pedes p. e.—Pervenit ad metam p. e.—Sæpe revisit agros p. e.—En! currit stadio p. e.—Currere gaudet agris p. e.—Vix pede tangit humum p. e.—Spargit humum pedibus p. e.—Stare loco nescit p. e.—Jam parere negat p. e.—Ore lupos mordet p. e.—Fræna indignatur p. e.—Sponte sua fertur p. e.—Rectorem spernit p. e.—Quam velox agitur p. e.—Ante alios rapitur p. e.—Prævertit reliquos p. e.—Non calcaris eget p. e.—Putre solum pulsat p. e.—It rapido cursu p. e.—Non paret domino p. e.—Exsuperat cursu p. e.—It medius turbæ p. e.—Non cessurus abit p. e.—Carpere gestit iter p. e.—It quacunq; viâ p. e.—Hostes proculcat p. e.—Carpit anhelus iter p. e.—Terga dabit nunquam p. e.—Visere rura solet p. e.—Per salebras tendit p. e.—Martis amat strepitum p. e.—Carcere primus abit p. e.—Dat sese comitem p. e.—Plectitur in gyrum p. e.—Tergo fert equitem p. e.—It citiore gradu p. e.—Pone volat cursu p. e.—Nil remoratur iter p. e.—Noluerit vinci p. e.—Carpit iter solitum p. e.—Ardet inire viam p. e.—Dat volitare jubas p. e.—Turpe putat vinci p. e.—Haud requiem patitur p. e.—Præterit obstantes p. e.

—Primus adest cursu p. e.—Gloria fertur equum p. e.—Curriculo vincit p. e.—Exultat spatio p. e.—Non segnis sequitur p. e.—Egrè fert vinci p. e.—Assuescit circo p. e.—Arva videre cupit p. e.—Currit huc illuc p. e.—Exspatiatur agris p. e.—It pede veloci p. e.—Festinat campis p. e.—Colla humore madet p. e.—Festinare potest p. e.—Transmittit campos p. e.—In campum tendit p. e.—Calce fent terram p. e.—Spumas oris agit p. e.—Ore reluctatur p. e.—Mare fugit venti p. e.—Turbinis instar abit p. e.—Cogitur ad cursum p. e.—Signat humum pedibus p. e.—Signa pedum figit p. e.—Vix gramen tangit p. e.—Verbere non agitur p. e.—Nunquam deferit p. e.—Hinc vires sumit p. e.—Ore tremens prociat p. e.—Ocyus ire solet p. e.—Attingit metam p. e.—Decurrit spatium p. e.—Egreditur castris p. e.—Insequitur lepores p. e.—Fulmina Martis amat p. e.—Propter iter sudat p. e.—Arma ducesque vehit p. e.—Bella cruenta colit p. e.—Solvitur ex stabulis p. e.—Eminet ante alios p. e.—It redit in gyrum p. e.—Emititur iter p. e.—Venatu assuescit p. e.—Non formidat iter p. e.—Ambit certamen p. e.—Ire per arva petit p. e.—Sponte volare solet p. e.—Ocyor evadit p. e.—Assequitur primos p. e.—Pone alios inquit p. e.—Fessus abire negat p. e.—Corripit inde gradum p. e.—Primus habet metam p. e.—Nescit habere parem p. e.—Exercet cursum p. e.—Nunquam fessus erit p. e.—Custodes fallit p. e.—Usque vagatur agnis p. e.—Pascua læta legit p. e.—Centum lustrat agros p. e.—Nescit ubi statat p. e.—It celerante gradu p. e.—Pocit iter flemu p. e.—Currit Olympium p. e.—Cum domino vincit p. e.—Non reugit campum p. e.—It quo fert animus p. e.—Ingeminat gressus p. e.—Accelerat campo p. e.—Arduus arva quatit p. e.—Non cessare potest p. e.—Vi magnâ erumpit p. e.—Sæpius excurrit p. e.—Passibus incedit p. e.—Martis it in Campum p. e.—Nutrit ire foras p. e.—Quam citò transit agros p. e.—Infert se medium p. e.—Ut cursus iterat p. e.—Rursus init campum p. e.—Rura superbus obit p. e.—Contendit cursu p. e.—Certat ovans plausu p. e.—Fine coronatur p. e.

Such are the variations which are now offered, but which, if it should be necessary, might still be extended to an indefinite number. There are here *one hundred and thirty-three* various readings in addition to the original one, all of which convey a distinct meaning of the *running* or speed of a horse.

D.

Bodmin, Cornwall, March 8th. 1815.

On the words φθορά, διαφθεῖρειν, διαφθορά, καταφθείρειν, καταφθορά, συγκαταφθείρειν, applied to the Illustration of several Passages in the Greek Tragedians, and Prose Writers, with Strictures on a Note in Mr. BLOMFIELD'S Edition of the PERSÆ OF ÆSCHYLUS.

ἀλλ' ἀμφ' Ἀθήνας πᾶς κατέφθαρται στρατός.

Æschyli Persæ. 722.

“Διέφθαρται Ald. Turn. et recentiores. κατέφθαρται Rob. K. et Colb. 1 Mosq. Viteb κατέφθατο M. 1. Supra 225. Ὡς ἐν μιᾷ πληγῇ κατέφθαρται πολὺς Ὀλβος. 351. Ἀλλ' ὥδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν. Infra 735. Ὡδε παμπήρην δὲ λαὸς πᾶς κατέφθαρται δορί. Porro διαφθεῖρειν in sensu perdendi non usurpatur, cum potius significet corrumpere, ut in Agam. 931. Hecub. 601. Hippol. 391. Bacch. 318.” Blomf. in Gloss.

Mr. Blomfield is perfectly accurate in reading κατέφθαρται for διέφθαρται; and the three passages, which he has quoted from this very play, appear decisive. But I am far from thinking with him, that κατέφθαρται is to be preferred to διέφθαρται, because “διαφθεῖρειν in sensu perdendi non usurpatur, cum potius significet corrumpere.” For we shall soon see that εὐφθείρειν is much more frequently used by the best writers in the sense of *destruction*, than in that of *corruption*. I read κατέφθαρται for a reason, which is founded upon the propriety of language, and which reason seems not to have occurred to Mr. B., that καταφθείρειν is employed by the purest writers to denote *universal destruction, the destruction not of individuals, but of whole armies, a whole multitude, a whole people*. So it is employed by Æschylus in the three passages adduced by Mr. B. from this very play.

351. Ἀλλ' ὥδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν.

735. Ὡδε παμπήρην δὲ λαὸς πᾶς κατέφθαρται δορί.

225. Ὡς ἐν μιᾷ πληγῇ κατέφθαρται πολὺς

Ὀλβος.¹

In the last passage, the epithet πολὺς will serve to convince Mr. B., that Æschylus, even in the metaphorical use of the word, has retained its proper notion of *number* or *multitude*. So too in the passage under consideration.

ἀλλ' ἀμφ' Ἀθήνας πᾶς κατέφθαρται στρατός.

Thus we have in Sophocles *Œd. T.* 331.

ἡμᾶς προδοῦναι καὶ καταφθεῖραι πόλιν.

¹ Mr. B. here gives a wrong reference—for the passage does not occur in 225; nor have I been able to find where it does occur.

We have in Euripides, *Ion*. 1235.

λεῦσιμοι δὲ καταφθοραί

i. e. *lapidatio*. Here we may retain the proper meaning of the word, by understanding *death occasioned by a multitude of stones poured down upon him or them*. In the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, the word frequently occurs in this its proper sense.

Es. xxiv. 1. Κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. Es. xliii. 5. καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Gen. vi. 17. ἐπάγω τὸν κατακλυσμὸν καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν σάρκα. 2 Macc. v. 14. ὁκτῶ δὲ μυριάδες κατεφθάρησαν. In Es. xlix. 19. ἔρημα σπύ καὶ κατεφθαρμένα sc. χωρία, κατεφθαρμένα denotes *complete devastation*. Exod. xviii. 18. Φθορὰ κατεφθάρησεν καὶ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος. See Biel's *Nov. Thes. philolog.* Here I may be permitted to remark that καταφθεῖρειν in the Septuagint sometimes occurs in the sense of διαφθεῖρειν, *corrumperere*. Gen. vi. 12. εἶδε Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἦν κατεφθαρμένη, *corrupta* : ibid. κατέφθειρε πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, *corruperat omnis carnem viam suam*. 2 Par. xlvii. 2. καὶ ἐτι ὁ λαὸς κατεφθείρετο, *et populus amplius corruptus erat*. We have in Jud. ii. 19. διέφθειραν (sc. τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν) ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας.

In the N. T. καταφθεῖρειν is not, as it should seem, once used in its proper sense of *corporeal destruction*, but is applied metaphorically to the *mind*. "Speciatim et metaphoricè, *erroribus et vitiis animum imbuo* : sic legitur in N. T. 2 Tim. iii. 8. ubi commemorantur homines κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, quorum animus ita perversus est, ut veritatem agnoscere et sequi nequeat. De depravatione morum καταφθείρεσθαι reperitur in vers. Alex. Gen. vi. 12. 2 Paral. xxvii. 2. Suid. καταφθορά· ὁ ἐν ἀνομίαις βίος καὶ παραβάσις. Perdo, disperdo, sive corporaliter (Jes. xxiv. 1. Gen. vi. 17. 2 Macc. v. 14.) sive moraliter, *miserum reddo et infelicem*, et speciatim de *pænis peccatorum* usurpatur. Sic autem reperitur 2 Petri ii. 12. ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται, *per impietatem suam summam sibi contrahent miseriam*, seu, perversitatis suæ aliquando gravissimas Deo pœnas dabunt. Sæpius non legitur in N. T. Lev. xxvi. 39. καταφθαρήσονται διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Suid. καταφθορά· ὁ αἰώνιος θάνατος, quæ glossa pertinere videtur ad Ps. xlviii. 9. ubi videndus Theodoretus." Schleusner *Nov. Lex. Gr. Lat. in N. T.* The noun καταφθορά does not occur in the N. T. Lucianus *Timon*. V. I. p. 148. ed. Reitz. ἡδυπαθεία καταφθείρας, where, however, as Reitzius says, "διαφθείρας J. (Junt.) Marg. A. W. (Aldmæ Primæ Wesselingii)," and I should prefer διαφθείρας, because for καταφθεῖρειν in this sense, I have seen no better authority than the Septuagint, and the N. T. in the places just cited. "Ps. xlviii. 9. ζήσεται εἰς τέλος, οὐκ ὄψεται καταφθοράν, *vivet in finem, non videbit corruptionem*. Ps. xv. 10. et Act. xiii. 35. Sir. xxviii. 6. μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παῦσαι ἐχθραίνων, καταφθοράν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ ἔμμενε ἐτολαίς." Biel. "Διαφθορά, speciatim *putrefactio, cui obnoxium*

est corpus humanum. Act. ii. 27. οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν θρόνον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν, neque cultorem tuum *sines putrefieri*, (coll. Ps. xvi. 10.) ii. 31. οὐδὲ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθοράν, *ne in putredinem abiit.* *ibid.* xiii. 34. μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, *ita ut nunquam moriatur*, *ibid.* v. 35—57. Næpius non legitur in N. T." It deserves to be noticed that, though καταφθορά is used in the Septuagint in the sense of "death," yet in the N. T. it is never so used, but διαφθορά is the word employed.

Mr. B. with his usual candor will not, I am persuaded, hesitate to admit the propriety of this remark on the word καταφθεῖραι, as denoting *universal, total* destruction, supported as it is by the examples already produced; and in Zonaras, Phavorinus, and Suidas, he will see additional reason for adopting the opinion, which I have endeavoured to establish. Phavorinus: φθορά ἐστι, κινήσις ἀπὸ τόπου εἰς τόπον ἢ φθορά ἐστιν ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος, ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν μεταβολή· λέγεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ φθίσθαι ῥαόν, ἥτις σήπescθαι εὐχερῶς· ἡ φθορά ἐστι λύσις καὶ διάλυσις τοῦ κατὰ σύνθεσιν συγκειμένου πράγματος.

Zonaras, φθορά· ἐστι κίνησις ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι. Again, Zonaras, and Phavorinus: φθορά· ἡ διάζευξις τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος. διαφθορά, ὅταν ἄλλη οὐσία δι' ἐτέρας ἀφανίζεται, ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τῶν σκωλήκων καταφθορά, ἡ παντελὴς ἀπώλεια. Suidas and Phavorinus have the following words—Διαφθορά· θάνατος, διάλυσις τοῦ συνθέτου σώματος. The words, which follow these, as Kuster tells us, are not to be found in the Ed. Mediolanensis, and two of the Paris MSS., and in the third Paris MS., they are written in the margin: they should be compared with the passage in Zonaras, of which I have just cited a part: φθορά, διαφθορά, καὶ καταφθορά· καὶ φθορά μὲν ἐστὶ σωμάτων νέκρωσις, καὶ ἀκίνησις τῶν ὀργάνων τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τούτου χωρισθείσης. διαφθορά δὲ, διάλυσις σώματος, καὶ παντελῶς ἀφανισμὸς, καὶ σκωλήκων κατὰβρωμα· καταφθορά δὲ, ὁ αἰώνιος θάνατος, ἢ παγνομία, καὶ παραβάσεις, καὶ ἀνομία· ὡς τὸ, Ὁ λαὸς ἐφθάρη ἐν ἀνομίαις. καὶ φθοράν μὲν ὑπέστη τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου σῶμα, διαφθοράν δὲ οὐ. Suicer in the *Thes.* *Eccles.* is silent about the words φθορά, διαφθορά, καταφθορά. Zonaras, under the word διεφθόρεν, has preserved a verse of Eupolis, ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ, where both the prepositions κατὰ and διὰ are joined to the word φθεῖραι,

ὅτι τὰ πατριά πρὸς σὲ καταδιέφθορα·

ἴμοιον γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ διεφθόρε· τῷ κατέσπορε καὶ ἀπέκτονεν. I have

1 "Thom. M. Ἀπέκτονεν κάλλιον ἢ ἀπέκτεινα· ἀπέκτανον δὲ ἀδόλιμον πάντῃ. Libanius T. i. p. 310. C. 332. Corrigendus Phavorinus, qui ἀπέκτανεν (ἀπέκτονεν) Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπέκτεινε: add. Idem v. ἀπέκτονα: Suid. v. ἀποκτινύναι." Witterus, Sallierus, and Stæberus, however, have referred to instances, where ἀπέκτεινα occurs in Lysias, in the Ælian, who wrote the *Var. Hist.*, in Plato, and in Xenoph. *Mær. Attic.* Ἀπέκτονεν, Ἀττικῶς· ἀπέκταμεν, Ἑλληνικῶς. "Attica, imprimis Xenopho, præteritum medium

further to remark, that the word *καταφθείρειν* is a word of very rare occurrence. It occurs in Sophocles only once. In Beck's Index to Euripides we have only the noun *κατάφθορα*. In Kuster's Index to Aristophanes the word is not to be found, nor is it to be met with in Herodotus, or Xenopho; nor have I been able to find it in Hippocrates. In the Index Lucianus it is mentioned only once. In the *Choeph.* 209. we have *φρενῶν καταφθορά*.

Let us now consider whether Mr. B. be correct in his notion that "*διαφθείρειν* in sensu *perdendi* non usurpatui, cum potius significet *corrumperere*, ut in *Agam.* 934. *Heiub.* 601. *Hippol.* 391. *Bacch.* 318." It is very easy to disprove this unqualified assertion upon testimony, which he himself will scarcely fail to admit. Phryni-

ἀπέκτονα usurpant pro activo *ἀπέκτακα*, vel *ἀπέκταγα*, ut *διέρθορα* pro *διεφθαρκα*, quanquam altero *ὀτεκτοκα* etiam usi sunt. Vetus Grammaticus ap. Suid. *Ἀπεκτακασι καὶ ἀπεκτονασι*. Μισοῦσι γὰρ, ὡς πλεον. *Θρασώνα, ἀπεκτακασι* δ' οὐ, quia in γ. *ἀποκτίννυσσι* repetuntur, et procul dubio e v. teri Coniunctio deprompta sunt. *Ἀπεκτονασι* legitur ap. Isocratem *Panathen.* nov. ed. l. ii. p. 211. Recte a Taylora rescriptum *Lysia contra Theomn.* p. 173.; nec tamen eidem adnexamur *contra Agorat.* p. 232. *ἀπέκτεινε* pro *απεκτανε* reponenti. Rectius scribis *απεκτοει*, et sic in Eurip. *Rheso* 978. legendum pro *ἀπέκτεινε*. Ap. Thom. M. forte scribi debet *ἀπεκταγα* οὐδ' ἀδόκιμον παντὴ, quod 2 *Reg.* iv. 2. occurrat." J. PIERSONUS. With the conjecture of PIERSONUS all scholars will be satisfied. Phrynichus Σοφιστ. Προπαρασκ. ap. Bekkerium *Anecd. Gr.* v. 1. p. 35. *Διεφθορεν*: οὐ τὸ διεφθάρται τοῦτο σημαίνει. ὁ καὶ ἰσχυροῦσιν οἱ λεγόντες· *Διεφθορεν* ὁ παῖς, δεὸν διεφθάρται· τὸ δὲ ὁ φθορε τὸ διεφθάρτε σημαίνει. So Bekker has given the words, but, as Stæbeus in the notes on Thom. M. v. *διεφθορεν* tells us, Salmerhus read *διεφθόρεν*, *διεφθάρται* οὐ ταυτὸ σημαίνει, and so I read myself before I consulted Stæbe's note. Thom. M. *διεφθορεν* ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφθάρη. Λουκιανὸς ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλ. οὕτως καὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ εἰσιγγυ· *Τῆ* αὐτοῦ διεφθορῶς τὸ σῶμα· ἅπαξ δὲ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφθαρ· Σοφοκλῆς, ἐν Ἠλέκτρᾳ (307.)

τάς οὐσας τέ μοι

καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἐλπίδας διεφθορεν.

But two other instances are quoted by Moschopolus, who is cited by Stæber l. l. ex edit. Vicos. *Διεφθόρες ἦθος τὸ διαφθέρειν, οὐ τὸ διεφθαρμενον. Ἀγιστοφάνης ἐν Κοραῖς· Διεφθόρες τὸν ὄνον ἡμῶν. Μεινόςος ἐν Ἀδελφοῖς. Εἶπε τις τὴν κίτην διεφθορῶς ε. τ. λ.* See Phavorinus in γ. *διαφθέρειν*, and in γ. *ἐφθάρειν*, αἶμα. *Λουκιαν.* *Διεφθόρεν*. οὐ τὸ διεφθάρται δηλοῖ παρὰ Ἀττικαῖς, ἀλλὰ τὸ διεφθάρκεν· Εὐπόλις,

Ὅς τὸν νεανίσκων συνὼν διεφθόρε—

καὶ ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ,

ὅτι τὰ πατρὶα πρὸς σὲ καταδιέφθορα.

Ἰουλιανὸς γάρ ἐστι τὸ διεφθορε τὸ καταστρεῖν καὶ ἀπεκτονεῖν. *Illym. M.* p. 754. l. 25. τὸ λελογα καὶ τέρεαδα, ἐνεστὶ· ἡκὴν εἰχει σημασίαν· τὸ δὲ τίθηται καὶ διεφθορεν, πρῆθητικῇ. οἱ αὐτοὶ γὰρ σχηματισμοὶ, καὶ ἐπὶ ἐνεργητικοῦ λυμβαίνονται καὶ ἐπὶ παθητικοῦ. Thus we see that Thomas Magister was mistaken in confining to Sophocles the active sense of *διεφθορεν*.

chus Σοφ. Προπαρασ. διέφθορεν, διέφθαρται οὐ ταυτὸ σημαίνει διὸ καὶ ἁμαρτάνουσιν οἱ λέγοντες· Διέφθορεν ὁ παῖς, δεὸν διέφθαρται.

Sophocles.

Œd. Tyr. 446. "Ἡδ' ἡμέρα φύσει σε καὶ διαφθερεῖ.

Philoct. 507. χ' ὥταν τις εὐ ζῇ, τηνικαῦτα τὸν βίον
σκοπεῖν μάλιστα, μὴ διαφθαρεῖς λάβῃ.

Aj. 1305. λαβὼν ἐπακτὸν ἄνδρ' ὁ φυτεύσας πατὴρ,
Ἐφῆκεν ἑλλοῖς ἰχθύσιν διαφθορᾶν.

Euripides.

Ion. 544. Ἰω. "Ὅδ' ἐκτεθεῖς παῖς ποῦ ὅστιν· εἰσὶν ἡ φάος;

Kr. Οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδεὶς· ταῦτα καὶ μαντεύομαι.

Ιω. Εἰ δ' οὐκέτ' ἔστι, τίνι τρόπῳ διεφθάρη;

Herc. Fur. 458. "Ἰεκεον μὲν ὑμᾶς, πολέμοις δ' ἐρριψάμεν
ἥβρισμα, κἀπὶ χερμα, καὶ διαφθοράν.

Hippol. 1353. Διὰ μ' ἐφθείρας, κατὰ τ' ἔκτεινας.

Iphig. T. 719. Ἀτὰρ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γ' οὐ διεφθόρεν σέ πω
Μαντεύμα. καὶ τοί γ' ἐγγυς ἐτήκεας φόνου.

Hec. 796. Ὅς εἰς σ' ἀνελθὼν, εἰ διαφθάρῃ σ' ἑταίρι,
Καὶ μὴ δίκην δώσουσιν, οἵτινες ξένους

Κτείνουσιν —

Hippol. 1434. Καὶ σοὶ παραινῶ πατέρα μὴ στυγεῖν σέθεν,
Ἰππόλυτ'· ἔχεις γὰρ μοῖραν, ἥ διεφθάρῃς.

Iphig. T. 1023. Οἱ μοι διεφθάρμεσθα· πῶς σωθῆμεν ἄν·

"Διαφθεῖρῃν, *interficere*, *Λ.* 4. 1, 8. ἐκινδύνευσεν ἄν διαφθα-
ρῆναι πολλὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος. 7. 7, 22. μὴ διαφθαρεῖν ἐν
τῇ στρατιᾷ, *ne opprimeretur*. *Ε.* 2, 1, 21. Φιλοκλῆς στρατηγὸς τούτους
διέφθειρεν. *q. l.* Leuncl. male explicabat de *animorum depravatione*.
4. 4. 11. διεφθέρντο, *peribant*. 7. 4, 19. αὐτὸς αὐτὸν διεφθέρει. *Ιερ.*
3, 8. ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τυράννους διεφθαρμένους. Sic *feræ* dicuntur *homi-*
nes διαφθεῖρῃν, *Η.* 1, 4, 7. *Αγ.* 1, 22. Eodem modo Socrates 2.
4, 52. verba hominis Syracusani, διαφθεῖραι παῖδα, intelligere vole-
bat. Sed ille intellexerat de *re venerea*: cf. sect. 53. συγκαθεύδειν.
Etiam Latini ita utuntur suo *corrumperet*. v. Herald. *Advers.* 1. 11.
—διαφθεῖρῃν, quovisunque modo nocere, perniciose ledere, *corrum-*
peret, ut urbem et artes direptione, *Η.* 7. 2, 4. et 5.—*Α.* 7, 2, 2.
στράτευμα διαφθειρόμενον dicitur *exercitus* ob varias sententias *dis-*
persus." *LEX XENOPHONT.* I-XX. *Intt. Mich.* ii. 10. ἐνεκεν
ἀκαθαρσίας διαφθάρητε φθορᾷ, *occisione occisistis*.

Thus then I have proved that διαφθεῖρῃν is used not only
by the purest Attic prose writer Xenophon, but by the trage-
dians Sophocles and Euripides, "in sensu perdendi," which Mr.
B. denies, and I shall proceed to show that he is not quite correct
in his language, when he says that it is not used "in sensu per-
dendi, cum potius significet corrumpere, ut in *Agam.* 934. *Hecub.*
601. *Hippol.* 391. *Bacch.* 318."

In the *Classical Recreations*, p. 252—9. and 486—8. I have shown that *φθείγειν*, *διαφθείγειν*, and *φθορά* are often employed by painters to denote “the mixture of different colors,” and I have there cited several instances of this technical use of the words.

“Hæc sibi *corrupto* casiam dissolvit olivo :

“Et Calabrum coxit *vitiato* murice vellus.”

Persius, *Sat.* ii. 64.

“Unguentum curat conficiendum e casia præsertim nigra, pretiosissimum. Omnia autem unguenta fiunt *miato* olivo ; nam oleum est materia apta suscipiendis odoribus servandisque : itaque in oleum transferuntur ab unguentariis : recte autem *corrupto* : quicquid enim desinit illud esse quod fuit, *corrumpi* dicitur : olim Lacedæmonii cum unguentarios urbe pellerent, criminis loco objecerunt, *quod oleum disperderent* : ergo etiam mixture, quales fiunt a myrepsis et pictoribus, sunt *φθοραί* : neque aliter pictores loquebantur, ut usurpat Plutarchus in *Symp.* viii. : sic *μιαίνειν* dixerunt pro *μυγνύειν*, et *μίανσις* pro *mistione*, ut disputant Plutarchus idem, ac Porphyrius ; et ita doctissimus Persius, sequente versu, *vitiato murice.*” J. Casaubon *Comment. in Persium.*

“VI. 30. Μὴ βαφῆς, ne mergaris et obruaris, Xyl. imo, ne tingaris, ne inficiaris : ne mores aulici genuinum animi candorem obfuscent, quod *inquinamentum* combibere Septimius dixit de *Spectac.* c. 14.

ὥς ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μίγη,
ut Homerus loquitur *Il.* δ. 141. 1. ut Maro *Æn.* xii.

Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro

Si quis ebur,

quod nos diceremus, ‘that you be not stained :’ nam quod Græci *μιαίνειν* et *βάπτειν*, nos dicimus ‘to stain.’ Eum autem Homeri locum respexit Plut. de *El. Delph.* ubi dixit, eadem usus, qua hic metaphorice Marcus, voce : Τὸ ἐν εἰλικρινὲς καὶ καθαρὸν· ἐτέρου γὰρ μίξει πρὸς ἕτερον ὁ μίαισμός· ὥς που καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐλέφαντά τινα φοινισσόμενον βαφῇ *μιαίνεσθαί* φησι· καὶ τὰ μίγνύμενα τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ βαφεῖς *φθειρέσθαι*, καὶ *φθορὰν* τὴν μίξιν ὀνομάζουσι : unde emaculandus auctor idem in *Symp.* l. viii. c. 5. Πάντα τὰ μεμιγμένα τῶν ἀμίκτων ἐπισφαλέστερα πρὸς σῆψιν ἐστὶ· ποιεῖ γὰρ ἡ μίξις μάχην, ἥ δὲ μάχη μεταβολή· μεταβολὴ δὲ τις ἡ σῆψις· διὸ τὰς τε μίξεις τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ ζωγράφοι *φθορὰς* ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τὸ βάψαι θίγειν αὶ κέκληκεν ὁ ποιητής : μῆναι legendum. Sicut et Latinis itidem *tingere*, *inficere*, et colore aliquo *tincta* dicuntur *infecta*. Idem in *Rom. Problem.* c. 26. Μόνον ὃν τὸ λευκὸν, εἰλικρινὲς καὶ ἀμιγρὲς καὶ ἀμίαντόν ἐστι βαφῇ καὶ ἀμίκτων. Sed et Porphyri. de *Abstin.* l. iv. καὶ ὁ μολυσμός καὶ ἡ μίανσις δηλοῖ τὴν μίξιν τοῦ ἑτερογενεῖος πρὸς ἕτερον· καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν δυσέκνιπτον γένηται· ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βαμμάτων, ἃ δὴ διὰ μίξεων συνίστανται, εἴδους ἄλλου ἄλλω συμπλεκόμενου *μιαίνειν* φασίν.

ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μίμην

καὶ ἔμπαλιν τὰς μίξεις φθαρὰς οἱ ζωγράφοι λέγουσιν· ἡ δὲ συνήθεια τὸ ἀμικτον καὶ καθαρὸν, ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀκραιφνὲς καὶ ἀκήρατον. Eadem hac metaphora usus est Marcus L. v. 16. ubi dixit, βάπτεται γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν φαντασιῶν ἡ ψυχὴ. et L. iii. 4. Sed in partem meliorem accepta, ubi de viro bono, δικαιοσύνη βεβαμμένον εἰς βάθος. Vult ergo καθαρὰν μὲν ν' διάνοιαν, ut L. viii. 11. aut, ut mox et se ipse explicat, ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀκέραιον. Senec. Ep. 59. *Etui difficile est: non enim inquinatus sumus, sed infecti*, i. e. οὐ μαιμασμένοι, ἀλλὰ βεβαμμένοι. T. Gatakeri Comment. in M. Antonin. vi. 30. p. 238. ed. 1697. 4to.

“ Dionys. Halic. περὶ ὁμομ. συνθεσ. xi. τῶν δὲ ἀμωτέρως τὰς τάσεις ἔχουσιν αἱ μὲν κατὰ μίαν συλλαβὴν συνεφθαρμένον ἔχουσι τῷ ὀξεί τὸ βαρὺ, recte interpretes commistum: infra p. 78. R: συνεφθαρμένων ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἰδίαν φωνὴν λαμβανόντων: interpretes, *literis se invicem mutua coitione corruptentibus*: nisi male, certe ποικιλικώτερον quam pro ratione prosæ Romanorum. p. 171. γραφαῖς συνεφθαρμένα τὰ φωνεῖν

The proverbial phrase δικαιοσύνη βεβαμμένον εἰς βάθος deserves to be noticed. “Ὅπως βαθυτέρα vi. 6. color purpure, qui videtur esse saturior: vide Hist. Anim. xii. 18. et xv. 28.: cf. ad hoc Virgil.

Pyali saturo fucatu colore

Servium et Jun. Phylargyrum: Cassiodorus L. I. Var. hunc purpure colorem eleganter vocat *obscurilatem rubentem, nigredinem sanguineam*. Philol. LII. de Animal. Propriet. ἡρὸς εἰς βάθος, quod Bersmannus vertit, *summe gilvus*, et LIX.

ἡ δὲ γε χρῶα

δοκεῖ φέρειν ἑξαλμα (i. ἑξαμμα) πορφύρας βαθύ:

interpretes, *At color conchyliatus in profunda cernitur*: Olympiodorus in I. III. Meteor. Aristot. τὸ ἀλουργόν ἐπὶ τὸ μελάντερον προστρέπει καὶ πορφυρίζον οἷον ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀλουργίῃ χρώμα, et alibi eundem colorem ait, βαθύτερον τῶν ἄλλων χρωμάτων, *pressiorum alius coloribus*: vid. et Salmasti Notas in Tertull. de Pallio p. m. 134. et Plinium xxi. 8.” Kuhnus in Indice Aethiani V. H. These passages unfold the origin of the phrase.

Eustath. p. 456, l. 5. ed. Rom. Μιαινέιν δὲ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ τὸ βάπτειν, ὅπερ ἄλλοι φασὶν ὁρᾶν φασὶν ἐκτεθεῖν καὶ Μιαιφόνος Ἄρης οὐκ ἐπὶ φόνῳ, ἀλλ' ὡς Αἰμοβαφής, καὶ Μιαρὸς αἵματι, οὐχ ὡς Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι παρὰ τοῖς ὑστερῖν αἱ τῶν κατοικομένων· ἀλλ' ὁ Αἰμοβαφής, κατὰ τὸ, οὐδέποτε μιαρὸς· ὅπερ ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς Ἰλιάδος κεῖται. Pag. 519, l. 1. Σημειώσται δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ Μιαιφόνος, οὐ δ' ἐνταῦθα Ἄρης, Ἄρες, βροτολοιγέ, μκαιφόνε) ἐπὶ ὕβρει κεῖται· τί γὰρ ἔδει μάτην οὕτω καὶ οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ, λοιδόρον εἶναι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν; ὅλοιοι δὲ ἀπλῶς οὕτως ὡς ἐν μετρίῳ σκάμματι τὸν Αἰμοβαφῆ· ἐστὶ γὰρ Μιαινέσθαι μὲν, τὸ βάπτεσθαι ὡς καὶ προγγράπται· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Μιαρὸς που νεκρὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔξῃς, ὁ αἰμοβαφής φόνος δὲ τὸ αἷμα ἐνθυμητέον δὲ καὶ ὡς ἐν τῇ προσεχῶς ἐκτεθείσῃ χρήσει τοῦ Ἄρηος, τὸν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ Μιαιφόνον, Μιαιφόνον ἐκεῖνος ἔφη. Helladorus Aethiop. x. 15. p. 479. (quoted by Prof. Porson on the Orestes v. 909.) “dixit, nigrum in candido Chariclea brachio circumlum memorans,” καὶ ἦν τις ὡς περὶ ἔβριος περὶδρομος ἐλέφαντα τὸν βραχίονα μιαινέιν.

τις σκιεῖς ἔχουσας. vid Hemsterh. ad Lucian. T. 1. p. 31.: tetigit nuper Matthæi ad Nummesium p. 133" Schæfer ad Dionys. Hal. *De Compos. Verb* p. 129. Mr. Schæfer then cites from the *Critical Rev. July* 1803, p. 343 an extract from a letter written by Mr. Upton to Dr. Taylor in consequence of his note in *Lycurg.* p. 328 ed. 8vo. "φθορὰ apud pictores est colorum commixtio—unius adeo rei cum altera commixtio est φθορὰ, et ex tali commixtione naturalis et proprius color perditur et corrumpitur (Vulg. *Georg.* II. 466. *Nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus olivæ*), unde φθίσσθαι est *commixtione corrumpere*. Plut. in *Sympos* p. 708. ἀνθρώπων μὴ ομοφύλων μὴδὲ ομοιοπαθῶν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συμφθᾶν νῦν, ἵε in unum confusorum, *commistorum*." This explanation corresponds with the remarks of Hemsterhuis, who e note is quoted entire in the *Class. Rev* p. 486, 7—"Pictoribus, unguentariis, ac tractoribus propria φθίσσιν, φθοραὶ, et συμφθίσσθαι de colorum unguentorumque diversis generis mixtura: hac quidem temperatione sua cinque perit pulchritudo, et corrumpitur, sed arte tamen aliis existit color, qui naturalem sæpe vincat."

We are not informed who first applied the term φθορὰ to denote "the mixture of colors" possible it is that Apollodorus the painter was the person Plut *de Glor. Athen* p. 346. Α' Ἀπολλόδορος ὁ ζωγράφος, ἀνθρώπων πρῶτος ἐξυρῶν φθορὰν, καὶ ἀπὸ χρωστικῶν, Ἀθηναίος, &c. But Plutarch, as quoted above, has well explained how the term came to have that signification, and Hemsterhuis has done so even more clearly. I may perhaps be permitted to suggest, that the painters might have taken the term from the philosophers, who understood by φθορὰ, as applied to death, ἡ κίνησις ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι, ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι μεταβολή (see *Zonaias*, and *Plavorinus* quoted above), and that from its frequent use as a philosophical term to denote "the change of being, or removal from this world to another," together with the circumstance that it is frequently joined with words signifying "change," came its sense of mere "change," or "alteration," which I shall proceed to show that it sometimes has, after having quoted the words of Plutarch, which will serve somewhat to illustrate my notion, and vindicate it from the charge of gross absurdity πάντα τὰ μμιγμένα τῶν ἀμίκτων ἐπισφαλέστερα πρὸς σήψιν ἐστὶ ποιῶ γὰρ ἡ μίξις μάχην ἢ ὁ μάχη μεταβολήν μεταβολή δ' ἐστὶ σήψις διὸ τὰ τ' μίξεις τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ ζωγράφοι "φθορὰς" ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τὸ βάψαι διῆναι (μῆναι) κέκληκται ὁ ποιητής Those, who reject the notion, which I have suggested to account for the signification of "change," will perhaps not withhold their assent from the idea that, as the word was used for "corruption," "deterioration by mixture," "adulteration," it at length acquired the meaning of "change," where no "corruption, deterioration, or adulteration," was included. Or we may thus explain it—That which is *changed*, is *corrupted*, and by a very natural pro-

cess of reasoning; the word, which signifies "corruption," is employed to denote "change," because the idea of "change" is involved in the idea of "corruption"—μεταβολή τις ἡ σῆψις, says Plutarch. We have in the *Agamemnon* v. 941.

γνώμην μὲν ἴσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ.

Stanley had at first translated the passage, "*Animum quidem scito me neutiquam corrupturum*," which he afterwards improperly corrected thus: "*Minime dissimulaturum me scito sententiam meam*." Abresch's note upon the passage runs thus: "*Lys. Or. in Andoc. p. 104. πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφθειρε. Isocr. ad Demon. p. 17. διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας. Eurip. Orest. 297. τὸ διαφθαρεῖν φρενῶν. Æschylus Choeph. 209. φρενῶν καταφθορά.*" Not one of the instances cited by Abresch is to the purpose. The words *διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας* in Isocrates mean, "when he was deprived of his reason in consequence of intoxication;" for a little before these words, we have *ὅταν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς ὑπὸ οἴνου διαφθαρή.* In the *Choeph.* 209.

πάρεστι δ' ἄδης καὶ φρενῶν καταφθορά,

the words *φρενῶν καταφθορά* denote "confusion, perturbation of mind." In *Lys. Or. in Andoc. p. 222, 3. ed. Reiske, πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφθειρε*, the word *διέφθειρε* means, as Reiske translates it, *mentem vitiauit et occaecavit.* Eurip. *Orest. 297.*

ὅταν δὲ τὰμ' ἀθυμήσαντ' ἴδης,

σύ μου τὸ δεινὸν καὶ διαφθαρεῖν φρενῶν

ἴσχαναι παραμυθού θ' :

here τὸ διαφθαρεῖν φρενῶν manifestly means "distraction of mind, or madness." Schol. *ὅταν δὲ ἴδης τὰμὰ, ἥτοι ἐμὲ λειποθυμήσαντα, τούτῃ ἐστιν μανέντα, σὺ τὸ δεινὸν ἐμοῦ, καὶ τὸ διαφθαρεῖν τῶν φρενῶν, ἥτοι τὴν διαφθοράν, ἔπεχε, καὶ κώλυε, παραμυθού τε.* Mr. Blomfield will be convinced of this in one moment. Dionys. Halic. *De Compos. Verb.* xviii. p. 246. ed. Schaefer. *πότερον τοσαύτη περὶ αὐτὸν ἦν ἀναίσθησία καὶ παχύτης, ὥστε μὴ συνορᾶν, οἵτινές εἰσιν εὐγενεῖς ἢ ἀγενεῖς ῥυθμοὶ, ἢ τοσαύτη θεοβλαβεῖα καὶ διαφθορά τῶν φρενῶν, ὥστε εἰδὸτα τοὺς κρείττους, ἐπιτα αἰρεῖσθαι τοὺς χείρονας*, where Schaefer cites this very passage without any remark. But in the verse of the *Agamemnon*, now under consideration,

941. γνώμην μὲν ἴσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ,

the words *γνώμην διαφθεροῦντα* do not mean what, in the four passages quoted by Abresch, is meant by *διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας*, "temporary loss of reason," "distraction of mind," or by τὸ διαφθαρεῖν φρενῶν, *φρενῶν καταφθορά*, "madness," or any *θεοβλάβεια*, as in the words of Lysias, *πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφθειρε*: but they mean to express simply that "he will not *change* his mind, or determination," and so Schutz rightly understood the passage. "*Atqui, quanquam hæc, quæ de moderato fortunæ usu dixisti, verissima sunt, non tamen ea adversus sententiam meam dicere, ut per stragula picta incedere recuses, cui respondens Agamemnon negat*

re commissurum ut propter uxoris studium SENTENTIAM MUTET." Schutz's good sense told him that this was the meaning, and he left it to others to reconcile this meaning with διαφθεροῦντα. As I had in the *Class. Recr.* p. 487. pointed out this to be the meaning of Agamemnon, I was somewhat surprised to find Mr. B., in his edition of the *Persæ*, ranking this passage among those instances, where διαφθεῖρειν has the sense of *corrumpere*. But perhaps, when he comes to the *Agamemnon*, he will favor us with some elucidation of his obscure word *corrumpere*. In the *Class. Recr.* p. 255. I have observed that μορφῆς διαφθορά in the *Prom. Desm.* 644. means "a total change of form:"—

καὶ τοι καὶ λέγους' ὁδύρομαι
θεόστυτον χειμῶνα, καὶ διαφθορὰν
μορφῆς, ὅθεν μοι σχετλία προσέπταν.

Stanley properly translates the words by "permutatio formæ," and even Mr. B. himself, who understands the words literally, for he translates them by "formæ ruina," is obliged to subjoin by the way of explanation "*mutatio in vaccam*."

Mr. B.'s second instance of διαφθεῖρειν in the sense of *corrumpere* is taken from Euripides *Hecub.* 601.

ὁ δ' ἐσθλὸς, ἐσθλὸς, οὐδὲ συμφορᾶς ὑπο
φύσιν διέφθειρ', ἀλλὰ χρηστός ἐστ' αἰεί.

I had quoted this passage in the *Class. Recr.* p. 487, and observed that διέφθειρε evidently signifies that the good man is not *changed* in his nature by calamity. But I now admit that we may very well understand by the words φύσιν διέφθειρε, "is not *corrupted* in his nature," "does not lose any of his goodness."

The third instance, which Mr. B. cites of διαφθεῖρειν in the sense of *corrumpere*, is from that notable passage in the *Hippolytus*, of which neither he nor Professor Monk can easily make sense without the aid of some such alterations, as I have made in the *Class. Recr.* p. 252-5. 484, 5.

v. 390. ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπεὶ δὴ τυγχάνω προγυῖος' ἐγὼ,
οὐκ ἐστ' ὅποιω φαρμάκῳ διαφθερεῖν
ἐμελλον, ὥστε τοῦμπαλιν πεσεῖν φρενῶν.
λῆξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὁδόν.

"Διαφθεῖρειν significat *abolere*, hic vero usu metaphorico *oblivisci*." Prof. Monk. If διαφθεῖρειν here means *oblivisci*, the remainder of the sentence ὥστε τοῦμπαλιν πεσεῖν φρενῶν has no meaning whatever, and must be expunged; for the sense of the words, with such an interpretation of διαφθερεῖν, is this.—"Since, then, I happen to be sensible of these things, (this human infirmity), there is no medicine, by which I could be brought to forget this passion, so as to fall into the opposite state of mind." But surely the state of mind opposite to love is *hatred*, and not *forgetfulness*; and surely any person,

not blinded by prejudice, would allow that it is absolutely impossible to suppose that Euripides, or any person in his senses, could write any thing so inconsequential in its reasoning as this.—“Since I am aware of these things, there is no medicine to make me forget my passion.” Mr. B., as we have seen, would translate διαφθείρειν in this passage by *corruptere*, and so far as this goes, he escapes the absurdity into which his friend, Prof. Monk, has fallen, by understanding the word to mean “oblivisci.” But till Mr. B. has presented us with a more correct view of the whole passage, I shall continue to read, point, and translate it thus—

ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπιτὴν τυγχάνω φρονούσ' ἐγὼ,
 κούκ ἐστ' ὁποῖον φαρμάκῳ διαφθερεῖν
 ἔμελλον, ὥστ' εἰς τοῦμπαλιν πεσεῖν φρενῶν,
 λέξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὁδόν.

“As then I am well aware of this (human infirmity), and as there is no drug (to be found), by which I was likely so effectually to *change* (my complaint), as to fall into the opposite state of mind, (that is, no drug capable of turning love into hatred), I will tell even to you what plan I mean to adopt.”

The last instance, to which Mr. B. has referred for διαφθείρειν in the sense of *corruptere*, is in the *Bacchæ* v. 318.

καὶ γὰρ ἐν Βακχεύμασι
 ὅς' ἢ γε σώφρων, οὐ διαφθαρήσεται,
 “qua natura pudica est, non corrumpetur.” Here I admit that διαφθαρήσεται means “corruption of morals.”

I have somewhere remarked that “the previous word φάρμακον, which signifies both a *medicine*, (or, a *remedy*), and a *color*, naturally suggested, upon the principle of the association of ideas, the metaphorical use of the word διαφθείρειν in the passage of the *Hippolytus*,” and I have to add, that the same thing has happened in another Play of Euripides—

ὅσας σφαγὰς δὴ φαρμάκων θανάσιμων
 γυναικες εὗρον ἀνδράσιν διαφθοράς; Eurip. *Ion*. 614.

We have in Diocl. Sic. Vol. I. p. 238. ed. Wess: Folio, τὸν πατέρα φαρμάκῳ διαφθείρειν.

I find that καταφθείρειν, συγκαταφθείρειν, and καταφθορά; which I have noticed as words of rare occurrence, are used by Polybius:—“Καταφθείρειν, τὴν χώραν (i. q. δηρὸν) vastare, II. 64, 3. et 7. coll. vs. 6. τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τῆς δυνάμεως, amittere (sicut διαφθείρειν) III. 60, 5.—Συγκαταφθείρειν τοὺς στρατιώτας, simul perdere, amittere,

¹ The conjecture of ὥστ' εἰς τοῦμπαλιν, for ἄστε τοῦμπαλιν, found its way as something original into the notice of Mr. Monk's *Hippolytus*, inserted in the *Quarterly Rev.*, though it had been published in the *Class. Recr.* many months before the said notice appeared.

ix. 26, 6.—Καταφθορά, ἡ, τῶν ἀνδρῶν, *interitus, cades*, i. 49, 4. ii. 21. 6. iii. 35. 3. τῆς Ἑλλάδος, *perniciēs*, xi. 6, 2. τῆς χώρας *devastatio*, iv. 67, 1. τῶν ἔργων, *destructio machinarum, igne crematarum*, i. 48, 8. ii. 21, 9." *Lex. Polybian.* Diodorus Siculus twice uses the word καταφθείρειν. Vol. i. p. 66. ed. Wess. Folio, τὴν συνεγγυὸς χώραν καταφθείρειν: p. 92. τὰ δ' ἄλλα κατεφθέρεθαι διὰ τὸν χρόνον.

Χράειν, χραύειν, χρίμπτειν, χρίειν, ζάχρητης, χραίνειν, ἀποχραίνειν, ἐπιχραίνειν, χρώζειν, ἀποχρώζειν, ἐπιχρώζειν, μολύνειν, *radere*: EURIPIDES illustrated.

Here it may be worth while to notice, as we are speaking on the subject of the terms used by painters, that Mr. B., when writing on the 61st verse of the *Sen. a. Thebes*, has fallen into a slight mistake—

v. 61. χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἱππικῶν ἐκ πνευμόνων.

"χραίνω, *inquino*: sensu primario *leviter attingo*: cf. Ruhnken. ad Timæum p. 276. Porson. ad Eurip. *Orest.* 909." Mr. B. But the "primary sense" of χραίνειν is not "*leviter attingere*," but the word is applied to "touching the skin of the body," and thence comes its meaning "to touch the superficies of any thing lightly," and thence "to come near any thing." Porson in the passage, to which Mr. B. refers, is much more correct in his language: "χραίνειν nihil aliud proprie significat, quam rei cuiusquam superficiem *leviter radere, vel attingere*." As we shall soon see, Porson was indebted to Eustathius for this interpretation of the word. Mr. B. refers us to Ruhnken's Timæus, as Porson had done before him, and there we are told that χραίνειν is properly a technical term used by painters: Timæus, χραίνειν, ἦγουν ἀποχραίνειν, παρὰ τοῖς ζωγράφοις δὲ λέγεται τὸ μὲν χραίνειν, τὸ χρώζειν διὰ τοῦ βαβδίου· τὸ δὲ ἀποχραίνειν, τὸ τὰς χρωσθέντα ἐνοποιεῖν, and J. Pollux vii. 129, enumerating the technical terms used by painters, says:—χρῶσαι, ἐπιχρῶσαι, ἀποχρῶσαι, ἀνθεσι φαίδρναι, χράναι, ἐπιχράναι, ἀποχράναι. See Hesychius in v. ἀποχραίνειν: I shall find another opportunity of discussing Hesychius's words. Let us now turn to Eustathius. "Ποτερὸν δὲ ὁ χρῶς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ χρώς, τὸ προφανόμενον ὁλοῖ τῆς κατ' ἀνθρώπον σαρκὸς, ἦγουν τὴν χροῖαν· κατὰ τὸ, παραδραβεῖν ἢ χροῖν διὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ, ἐν χρῶ, ὁμοιότητα ἔχει τὸ χρώζειν· οἶον, ἴονατα μὴ χρώζειν ἐμά· ἦγουν χρωτίζειν καὶ ἐν χρῶ ἔχειν. ὁμοιον δὲ καὶ τὸ Ματῆν κεχρώσμεθα· ἦγουν ἱκετεύσθμεν κατὰ δεξιάν καὶ γνάτα· τοιοῦτον δὲ καὶ τὸ χραίνειν κατὰ παραγωγὴν· οὐ πρῶτος μετέχει ὁ χρῶς· ἐξ οὗ τέτραπται φραγικῶς καὶ τὸ, Ἀγυρᾶς χραίνων κύκλον· συγγενὲς δὲ τοῖς

τοιούτοις καὶ τὸ χρεῖμπτειν, ὃ ἐστὶνεν χρῶν παλάζειν· καὶ τὸ χρεῖν·
 ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ χράειν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπιπίπτειν: p. 467. ed. Rom. Again,
 p. 1063. l. 23. ὡς Δαναοὶ Τρώεσσιν ἐπέχραον, ἦγον ὡς καὶ προεῖρήθη
 ἐνεπέπεσον, καί, ὡς εἶπεν, ἐν χρῶ· ἐπὶ ἄλλοις, ζαχρηῖς οὖν ἐνταῦθα οἱ
 Δαναοὶ ὡς ἀλλαχοῦ οἱ Λύκιοι διὰ τὸ χράειν, ἐξ οὗ ὁ ζαχρηῖς·
 καιρία δὲ ποιηταῖς ἡ τοιαύτη λῆξις, διό καὶ δις ἐνταῦθα κεῖται κατ' ἐπιμονὴν
 ἢ τε τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς παραβολῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποδόσει. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τε ἀπὸ
 τοῦ χράω, γίνεται πλεονασμὸς αἰολικῶ τοῦ ὤ, χράω· οἶον, Χράωσθ' μὲν
 τ' αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενεν. καὶ ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἔχραε. καὶ τὸ παρ' Ἡροδότῳ
 ἐνέχραεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον. καὶ τὸ ἐπέχραε. καὶ τὸ χραῦται. καὶ τὰ
 ἐκ τούτων, χρωτὸς καὶ χροὸς ποῖάν ἐπαφὴν ἠλοῦσι· καὶ ὅτι
 ἐκ τοῦ χράω χρῶ παρὰ γὰρ τὸ χραίνω, καὶ τῷ ῥῶ ῥαίνω· χραίνειν δὲ,
 αἰεὶ ἐπὶ φύγει, κατὰ τὸ, ἄστὺ κἀγορὰς χραίνων κύκλον. οὐ μὴν καὶ τὸ
 μολύνειν τοιοῦτον εἰς ὃ τὸ χραίνω μεταλαμβάνεται αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὸ μὲν
 μολύνων τὴν ὑπὴν, ψογερόν ἐστι· τὸ δὲ, Ἰχθυδίων ἀποκνίσας τὰ κραινία
 ἐμόλυν' ἀλεύρω, τεχνικὸν ἐστίν, ὡς ἐπὶ τηγανίσματι γὰρ· δηλαδὴ ἐῤῥεθη.
 Phavorinus, who has this passage, for ἰχθυδίων, gives ἰχθυδίων, for
 ἀποκνίσας gives ἀποκνίσας, for ἐπὶ τηγανίσματι gives ἐπιτηγανίσματα.

Before I close this article, it may be worth while to notice a
 strange opinion entertained by Facius about the celebrated passage
 in Eurip. *Orest.* 909.

ὀλιγάκις ἄστὺ κἀγορὰς χραίνων κύκλον.

“χραίνειν ἄστὺ, frequentare astu, ut χραίνεσθαι πόλιν, Soph. *Ced.*
C. 381.” But the passage in Sôphocles by no means warrants
 this interpretation of the passage in Euripides:—

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἦν ἔρως, Κρέοντί τε
 θρήνους ἐᾶσθαι, μηδὲ χραίνεσθαι πόλιν,
 λόγῳ σκοποῦσι τὴν πάλαι γένους φθιραν,
 οἷα κατέσχε τὸν σὸν ἄλιον δόμον.

Σχολ. παλ. Πρὶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς· πρῶτον ἦσαν σκοπήσαντες, τῷ Κρέοντι
 παραχωρῆσαι τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν. Κρέοντί τε· ὃ τε πλεονάζει. Λόγῳ σκο-
 ποῦσι· μετοχή ἐστίν, οὐ ῥῆμα. The passage is, as I frankly own, to
 me very obscure. Brunck reads ἔρως, and thus writes:—“Libri
 omnes ἦν ἔρις, quod series narrationis falsum esse ostendit, et a
 librario huc retractum fuit e. v. 372.: Th. Tyrwhitti conjecturam
 recepi, qua nihil certius mihi videtur: sic ἔρως occurrit infra 436.
 Eurip. *Phæn.* 631. *Alc.* 1101. *Suppl.* 139. *Iphig. A.* 813. et
 passim: vide notata ad prioris *Edipi* v. 601.” The anonymous
 writer of the *Observations on Sophocles*, appended to Bishop
 Burgess's Edition of *Burton's Pentalogia* p. 52. retains ἔρις, and
 thus explains the passage: “Dele interpunctionem post ἔρις, quæ
 quidem ap. Aldum nulla est: duarum sc. contentionum mentionem
 facit, quarum prior (utrum sc. solium relinquerent *Cedipi* filii) erat
 inter ipsos et Creontem; posterior autem (de occupando) inter
 se ipsos.” In the *Lexicon Græcum*, subjoined to the *Pentalogia*,
 we have—“χραίνειν, C. 369. polluo urbem, quasi imperio injusto

regens." "Annuon præstiterit *eros*, votum, cupido? ut infra 449. Ciconti enim regnum permittentes, de quo contenderent, nihil erat."

In the passage of Euripides,

ὀλιγάκις ἄστῳ κἀγορᾷς χραίνων κύκλον,
χραίναν clearly means "approaching," "coming near." Thus in the Scholia we have:—Τὸ δὲ Ὀλιγάκις ἄστῳ κἀγορᾷς χραίνων κύκλον, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησίαις οὐ περιερχόμενος, οὐδὲ πλησιάζων. In addition to the passages cited from Eustathius, I add one, which occurs in p. 531. l. 10. on *Iliad*. ε'. 138.

Δὴ τότε μιν εἰς τόσσον ἔλεν μένος ὥστε λέοντα,

ὃν ῥα τε ποιμὴν ἀγρῷ ἐπ' εἰσπόκοις ὀίσσει,

χραύσῃ μὲν τ' αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενον:—

χραύσαι δὲ λέγεται, τὸ ἐπιπολῆς ἔεσαι εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν χροῦν τοῦ σώματος· καὶ γίνεται ἐπενθέσει· ἦγουν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ὕ, ἀπὸ τοῦ χράω· ὡς τὸ ἔχρας κήδειν καὶ μητέριμοι μνηστῆρες ἐπέχραον. ὡς δὲ χράω χραύω, οὕτω καὶ λάω. οἶον, Ἰσπαίροντα λάων, καὶ κατὰ πλεονασμον λαύω· ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ ἀπλαύω· καὶ λευκανία ὁ λαιμός. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄω αὖω τὸ πνέω καὶ φωνῶ. καὶ ψάω ψαύω καὶ ἐλάω ἐλαύω ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἐλαύνω. Etym. M. χρεῶ· τὸ ξέω, ἐξ οὗ χραύω χραύσω, Ἰλιάδος ε', χραύσῃ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμύξῃ ἐπ' ὀλίγον τὸν χρεῦτα, ἐπιξύσῃ, ἥτοι προσεγγίσῃ· ἀπὸ τοῦ χρεωτός, χρεῶ, οἶον προσψαύσῃ. The metaphor in Euripides is derived not a *polluendo*, as Musgrave supposes, but a *radendo*, and this interpretation may be well defended by the exactly similar use of *radere*, "to approach," in the Latin poets. "Sæpe a poetis *radere* dicitur, qui prope locum aliquem transit, ita ut pæne contingat, qui præternavigat, prætervolat, corner vicino, andar rasente: Virg. *Æn.* vii. 10. *Primum Circeæ raduntur littora terræ*: Valer. Flacc. v. 108. *alta Carambis Raditur*: Virg. *Æn.* III. 799. *Altas cautes projectaque saxa Pachyni Radimus*: *Æn.* V. 169. *Ille inter navemque Gyæ, scopulosque sonantes Radit iter lævum interior*: Ovid. *Am.* III. el. ult. v. 2. *Raditur hæc Elegis ultima meta meis*: Propert. III. 2. 23. *Alter remus aquas, alter tibi radat arenas*: adde Lucanum viii. 246. Simile est illud Ovid. *Met.* x. 654. *de pernicious cursoribus: Posse putes illos sicco freta radere passu, Et segetis canæ stantes percurrere aristas*: Virg. *Æn.* V. 216. *de columba, Aere lapsa quieto Radit iter liquidum, celeres neque commovet alas, 'fende e scorie l'aria.'*" Forcellinus in *Lex.*

Halton, May 4, 1815.

E. H. BARKER.

BENTLEII EMENDATIONES INEDITÆ IN ARISTOPHANEM.

[No. III.—Continued from No. XXII. p. 259.]

IN RANAS.

COLLATUM est hoc drama cum MSto Barocciano [fortasse eodem libro quem in partes suas vocavit Gaisfordus ad Hephaest. p. 303.]

4. σχολή. Suidas in Πάνω [habet] σχολή: male; neque Kusterus correxit. [At Daves, p. 292, σχολή verum esse contendit.]

7. MS. Θάρρων γ· μόνον δ' ἐκεῖν ὅπως: [Ita MS. Binnckii.]

11. ἔται: Suid. in Ἐξεμ in habet ὅτε. Forte lege πλήν γ' ὅτε μέλλω γὰρ ἔξεμειν. Sed in Μέλλω [unde illud ἐγὼ hausit Bentl.] ὅταν μέλλω γ' ἔξεμειν.

39. In Schol. “καὶ Μανίας καλουμένης ἄκρας.” Immo Μαλέας — ἄκρας in Xenophont. Ellen. I. 446. Strabone est Μαλία, quod iertius.

34. ἵππ' MS. ἵπγ'· mox, Schol. ἡμλ—pro φημί: dein, pro νῆ Δία habet μὰ Δ. [sic MS. apud Br.]

51. Ita MS. HP. σφώ, ΔΙ. νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλω· HP. κατ':

55. μικρός· MS. μικρός: alia manu α scribitur super η. Suid. μικρός in Μόλων.

57. ξυν γένου Κλεισθένης; MS. inserit τῷ. [sic alii]

64. lege ἡ τέρα [et sic Seidler de Vers. Dochniac p. 388.]

76. Σοφοκλέα ultimam habet longam. Aut ergo lege Εἴτ' οὐ Σοφοκλέα πρότερον ὄντ' Εὐριπίδου; aut οὐχί, deleto ὄντ'.

79. MS. εἴπερ γ' [sic MS. Boig.] mox v. 86, MS. Ξενοκλεης.

99. lege τοιουτοί Suid. τοιουτονί in Παθακεκινδυνημένον.

100. χρόνου τόσα Euripides Bacch. 886

102. ἰδία: MS. ἀνευ Suid. I. c. Ἰδία ἢ ἀνευ.

103. Suid. in Σ' δ' κ.τ.λ. habet Σ' δ' ταῦτ' ἀρ' σκεῖ μάλλον: Sed MSS. Kusteri μ' ἀλλά· Vid. v. 624, 757. 763. Achai. 458. Av. 109. Sic οὐ γὰρ ἀλλά est affirmativum: vid. [Eq. 1202, et Gaisford ad Hephaest. p. 27, et Markland ad Suppl. 569.]

Ibid. MS. σοι. mox. 104. MS. κόβαλα [sic MSS. apud Br.]

108. lege ἔνεκα [Sed οὐνεκα est magis usitatum, tam Comicis quam Tragicis]: mox MS. ἔχων [pro φέγων]. MSS. Br. ἐνεκα—ἔχων.

121. γὰρ omittit Suid. in Θράνιον, Κάλως et Πνίγευς.

131. MS. πῆ: et mox 136 ἀλλ' ἡνπερ [ubi vulgo deest ἀλλ'.]

137. ἤξει μεγάλην Suid. in Ἀβυσσος.

138. dele γε [et sic MS. apud Br.]—146. νῶν MS. σχολ. ῥέον.

174. πῶς: MS. ποῖ: et mox 176. MS. ἦν ἄν [vice ἔαν.]

185. MS. ΔΙ. Νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ.

186. delete ΔΙ. Bentleius sequitur Schol. [sic Hotibius.]

186. σαπυροί: leg. σάτυροι. [Hæc emendatio est feliciter exco- gitata: etenim Achæus plurimas fabulas Satyricas composuit.]

193. Forte lege τὴν περὶ τῶν ἄκρων. Intelligit Carias Argi- nusas. vel περὶ τὴν ἄκραν: ut Malia intelligatur. Vid. v. 33. Pho- tius in Κρέας—"Τὴν περὶ τῶν κρέων." Οὗ δὲ Ἰξίωνα γράφει τὴν περὶ τῶν νεκρῶν τῶν ἐν Ἀργινοῦσαις ἀτάφων, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀνηρέθησαν οἱ στρα- τηροί. Sane τὸ νεκρῶν optimè personæ Charontis aptatur.

Ibid. In Schol. sic legitur Sophoclis fragmentum Τοιοῦτος ὦν ἄρξει: σὺ τοῦδε τοῦ κρέως: vulgo deest σύ: [quod supplevit B. in Κρίσει.]

195. τρέχων: MS. κύκλω [sic MSS. alii.]

197. ΔΙ. μανθάνεις. Ita MS.—209. MS. κατὰ πάλαι.

211. MS. semper Βρεκεκίξ: Et Suidas in Βρεκεκίξ et Αἰόλῳ. [Ipse Bentleius semper Βρεκεκεκίξ.]

220. MS. τῆς ἰερῆς χύτρας.

222. Totum hunc versum omittit MS. et 269.

235. ὑπολύριον: lege ὑπολύδιον vel ὑποβρύχιον.

240. MS. ἀγκύφας.

242. forte παύσασθε νῦν: ut versus hi duo sint pares [scil.

Ἄλλ' ὦ φιλωδὸν γένος παύσασθέ νυν

Μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν φθγγεζόμεσθ', εἰ δὴ ποτ' εὐ—]

245. MS. ἡλώμεθα.—Suid. in φλέω. 247. lege πολυκολύμβοισι.

252, 3. Utroque Baccho tribuit Bentr. Similiter 263, 4.

288. MS. Ποῦ ποῦ ὅστιν. ΞΑ. ἐξόπισθεν. MS. Vat. ποῦ ποῦ ἐξόπισθεν.

292. Onissum γε in Frob. supplet Bentr. e Suid. in Εμπουσα. et MS. ubi bis ποτε [sic MS. Rav. et alii.]

295. γ' omittit Suid. in Εμπουσα [sic MSS. apud Br.]

297. MS. ΔΙ. καὶ δκέλος et ΞΑ. Νῆ τὸν [sic MS. Rav.]

302. δέ γ' ἦττον: MS. δ' εἴ ἦττον: lege γ' εἴ ἦττον [sic MSS. apud Br.]

304. lege πάντ' ἄγαθα. [sic MSS.]

305. In Schol. ita legit Bentr. Fragmentum Strattidis Α, ποὶ πρὸς θεῶν ποὶ ποὶ γαλήν. Β. γάλην. Α. ἐγὼ δ' ὦμην σὲ λέγειν γαλήν ὀρώ: et ad illud Samyrionis adscripsit varias lectiones τί—ἐνδύ- σομαι—οὗτος εἰς ἐχθροὺς μέγα quas præbet Schol. ad Orest. 279. ubi corrigit Bentr. Ὁρέστην—et Κινάροῦ: hic vero reposuit εἰσιδῶν μέγα.

307. Olim voluit Bentr. κατόμοσόν μοι. Νῆ Δία: collatis Nub. 1234. ἀπομόσαι μοι τοὺς θεούς: et Ἀν. 444. κατόμοσον—μοι postea inseruit e MS. τὸν omissum in Frob. ante Δία. [sed melior videtur conjectura quam MS. lectio. vid. vers. seq.]

311. MS. μοι [sic duo alii teste Beck] mox idem τὰ κακὰ ταυτὶ [duo apud Br.]

314. αὐλαὶ τις ἔνδον. Hæc, vulgo in textu posita, delet Bentr.

Collato Schol. ad v. 1282. Achar. 115. [ubi exstat ἡ περιγεγραφή, ἐκινεῖται.] Av. 223. [ubi ἄλλῃ τις in textu sedem habet.]

318. MS. Baccho tribuit.

326. et sqq. Στρ. 343 et sqq. Ἀντιστρ. [Vid. Hermann. de Metris, p. 352.]

327. MS. ἐν ἔδραις [sic Rav.] mox σὴ [pro σῶ.]

328. MS. Ἰακχ' ὡς Ἰακχ' ὡς Ἰακχ'.

336. τιμάν: lege τ' ἐμάν: mox dele comma-post φλογί.

347. MS. ἀποσείονται [ut alii]: mox omittit τ'.

353. MS. λαμπάσι. [ut unus MS. apud Br.]

354. MS. et Schol. ἔξαγ' ἐπ' ἀνθρόν.

358. γνώμη Suid. in Ἐξίστασθαι. mox καθαρεύει Suid. Gellius [in Praefatione, p. 11.] Plutarch. [11. p. 348. D.]

359. οἶδε: Recte Ald. ἴδε: Gellius et Suid. in Ταυροφάγου, εἶδεν: Plutarch. ἦσεν.

372. lege τοῖσιν: MS. Gellius et Suid. in Ἀπαυδῶ dant τοῦτοῖς. ibid. post καθύς inseritur τὸ τρίτον a Suid. et Gell. MS. τρίτον.

375. et sqq. Hos in sex versus dispescunt Bentl. nec tamen Antistrophicorum nomine insignivit, licet sex ejusdem mensurae in ordinem redegerit quorum initium posuit in v. 380. Ἀλλ' ἔμβρι. [Hotibius vero eos Antistrophicos appellat.]

ibid. δὴ νῦν: dele δὴ et leg. νῦν encliticum: vid. 443. χωρεῖτε νῦν.

383. εἰς τὰς ἄρας: dele τὰς [recte: in hac formula non usurpatur articulus: cf. Lys. 392. et 1036.]

387 et sqq. necnon 392 et sqq. disposuit Bentl. ut exstant in edd. Kust. et Br.

391. παῖσαι: lege παῖσαι [sic voluit Kust.]

397. Ἀγ' εἶα: forte Ἀλλ' εἶα.

401 et sqq. Numeris Arabicis notavit versus quatuor; quos liceat systema α [Anglice stanza] vocare.

406 et sqq. systema β'. 4. vers.

407. lege τὸν τε σανδαλίσκον.

ibid. Suidas Εὐτέλεια, μικροπρέπεια. Εὐτέλεια δὲ εὐδαιμονία παρὰ τὸ εὖ τελεῖν Ἀριστοφάνης. Σὺ γὰρ διδάμην Ἐπ' εὐτελείᾳ τὸν σανδαλίσκον. Videtur alius esse locus. [Non reperitur inter Aristophanis fragmenta a Brunckio congesta.]

412 et sqq. systema γ'. 4. vers.

419 et sqq. Disposuit ut exstant in Kust. et Br. quatuor systematibus 3 vers. notatis.

421. In Schol. "Post ὄδοντας Suidas in Φράστηρας inserit. Φράσ- τηρας: quod Palmerius ut suum dedit."

425. lege κάστιν: mox MS. Κλεισθένην.

430. lege ὡς ναφλοστῖος [et sic Porson ad Orest. 1645.]

433. κούθου MS. et Suid. in Ἰππόπονον.

440. MS. αἶθροι: vid. 505 et 607. [Sic alii MSS.]

443 et sqq. et 447 et sqq. duo systemata 4 vers.

ibid. lege χωρεῖτε: mox dele θεῶς.

447. *AI.* omittit MS. mox lege ταῖσιν—παννυχίζουσιν [sic Hottibius.]

451. MS. πολυῤῥόθους cum σχολ. πολυήχους.

ibid. et sqq. necnon 457 et sqq. notantur quasi systemata, quæ in Ald. et Kust. sunt Antistrophica.

458. καὶ delet MS. et legit ἱερὸν: vid. Schol. ad 443.

461. τοὺς omissum supplet MS. [sic alii.]

468. MS. καὶ τολμηρεὶ κἀναίσχυντε σύ: vid. Pac. 181. et 361.

470. MS. ἡμῖν.

476. dele ἦ vel lege ἑκατογκέφαλος: vid. Nub. 335. [sic MSS.]

477. πνευμόνων MS. et Suid.

476. In Scho. βεύσονται: "βδ. ὕσονται."

486. MS. πρόσθου *EA.* πούττιν [ut alii.]

491. Οὐκ οὐκ ἂν [sic MSS.]

497. lege ληπατίας: Suid. in Ἰθὶ habet ληματιάς.

501. Suidas in Οὐ γὰρ habet πιστέον. Vide etiam eum in Πειστέον et Πιστέον.

511. Κῆλλιστα est excusantis, recusantis ut Latinis, Recte, Benigne; et sic paulo post χαλῶς. [Et sic Scholiastes: quem vide ad v. 913.] Recte quoque Scaliger personas distinguit.

515. Scal. *ΘΕ.* pro *AI.* et delet *ΘΕ.* in vers. seq.

519. Inter Schol. ad verba τῶ αὐτῷ ποιητῇ addit Bentl. "ἐν Ἀημνίαις Hesych. in Δορυάλλος. lege Αἰ δὲ γυναῖκες τὸν Δορυάλλον φράγγνυνται. Vid. Etymol. in Δορίαλλος."

522. Male Scal. φράσαν. Nam Θεράπεινα loquitur non Θεράπων.

ibid. δεχνηστρίαι MS. et Suid. in Αὐτός.—534. "Ὅς Scal. male.

541. Suid. in Μαλθακώτερον habet Μεταστρέφειν ἄει.

547. δῆ: lege ἦ. MS. Vat. ἄν. [Vid. Porson. Hom. Od.]

550. lege κυνῶν [et sic Br.]

556. MS. μ' ἐξέκοψε [sic MS. C. apud Br. qui sæpe cum Barocc. convenit.]

559. lege κατέφαγ': [et sic Hermann. de Mètr. p. 152.]

ibid. MS. ἡμῖν. et vice *ΠΑ.* semper habet Ἐτερ. Πανδοκ.

566. Hic MS. addit Ἐτερ. *II.* et *ΠΑΝ.* 567 et 569. cuius vice in locis proximis legit Bentl. *EA.*

568. ὅνπερ σύν: MS. ὃν οὗτος [et sic alii.]

570. εἰς μὲ Suid. in Ἐμυκᾶτο.

573. MS. initio versus præfigit *ΕΑΝ.*

575. lege ἐξάσας [et sic Kust. in notis.]

593. τύπτῃς MS. et Suid. in Οἶδ' οἶδα.

601. σαντὸν ἄει omittit MS.

607. Ald. ἀνάγκη τις: lege ὅτιν: [et sic Beck.]

624. In Schol. Non μάλα: sed μ' ἀλλά: vid. 103 et Thesm. 653 ubi [ubi corrigit Bentl. μ' ἀλλά vice μάλα.]

631. βασανῶ Suid. in Βασανίζω et Κλιμακίζω.

635. Ald. et Suid. γητείω.—638. ἔτι δ' εἰς Suid. in Κλίμακιν.

640. MS. σὺ ταχέως τὰ σκεύη.

657. MS. σκόπει νῦν ἦν μ' ἀποκινήσαντ' : MS. Vat. ὑποκινήσαντ' recte.

658. δοκεῖς : lege δοκεῖ vel δοκῶ [sic Reisk. et Schafer, si recte memini.]

662. δὲ omittit MS.—665. lege πάλι et sic in 671.

668. ἐπειτα : MS. ἐπὶ [et sic duo Harleiani teste Elmsleio ad Acharn. 178. in Auctario.]

678. Scal. πρωνός.—687. MS. ἐμας αἰοιδᾶς.

693. lege θήκη [sic Br. perperam : κονίας est Bacchius.]

694. κελαρῦζει Suid. in Ἐπὶ κλαύτον.

696. ἀπόλοιτο Suid. in Ὡς ἀπόλοιτο.

701. In Schol. Τραγικῶν agnoscit Suid. in Παλαίσμασι : in Φρύνιχος habet στρατηγῶν.

717. MS. ποτ' : [et alii] et in 720 γ' οὗτος.

718. In Schol. lege ὦ πολιῆται.

724. dele τε : quod habet Suid. in Κλειγένης et Κυκησιτέφρου.

726. MS. ἐκδιατρίφει : mox fo. ἰδῶν vice εἰδώς.

732. In Schol. ἀλλὰ νικά. fo. Ἑλλάνικος [sic Tyrwhittus in Not. MSS.]

741. Stobæus, p. 241=169. παλαίστρα et in 747. ἀξίου γάρ : Grot. γοῦν.

742. προσελοῦμεν MS. Ald. Suid. et Stob. at MS. unus Stobæi προυγελοῦμεν : quæ vera est lectio. Hesych. Προυγελεῖν. At Grotius προὔξελαίμεν : male.

748. MS. σφαλεῖτ' : Suid. in Ἀξιον habet καὶ τε σφαλεῖτ' : at in Ἀπὸ καλοῦ ξύλου et in Κᾶν τι habet καὶ τι.

750. MS. Αἶακ : sed ex alia manu Δούλος Αἶακ : et sic incipit.

757. leg. μ' ἀλλὰ vid. 103. et sic in 763.—759. MS. τονθορῶζειν.

763. MS. Vat. ἀττ' ἄν.—765. Citat Photius Μιαινεσθαι.

771. MS. et Ald. πᾶγμα πᾶγμα : mox γὰρ omittit MS.

775. MS. ξυντυχῶν : et mox κατῆλθ' [sic alii.]

809. Etymologus in Τάλαντον habet Ἄλλ' ἢ—κριθήσεται.

810. MS. τί δαί.

812. Suid. in Πλάσια habet ξύμπηκτα. MS. ξύμπτυκτα.

816. Ἐβλεψε γοῦν MS. et Suid. in Ταυρηδόν.

819. lege Ἀθηναίσις : sed Suid. in Συνέβαινε habet Οὐ γὰρ Ἀθηναίοισι.

826. et sqq. Quatuor systemata septem vers. Benth. numeravit.

829. MS. ὀδόντ' Ald. ὀδόντα. forte legendum θήγοντά τ' ὀδοντας.

835. lege σκινδαλάμων [sic MSS. duo apud Br.]

853. MS. πνευμόνων et mox μεθείμην [sic MSS. duo.]

861. Suid. in Ἀγριοποιόν : et sic in Ἐγῶδα : at in Ἀγρίωπον ut MS. e qua manu : ubi σχολ. ἄγρων τὴν φωνήν : [quare an μορφήν præbeat MS. ?]

862. Suid. Ἀπύλωτον : at ἀθύρωτον in Ἀγρίωπον.

879. θείων Suid. in Κεφαλαίω.

891. lege ὦ γὰρ νῶν [sic Dawesius.]
 898. MS. ἐπάσατε legit ὑπάσατε Etymol. in Ὑπογραμμός
 899. MS. addit ὦ et Καὶ in 908. et in 905. omittit τε.
 904. lege στρεβλοῖς.—910. MS. σοφίας ὁδὸς [sic alii.]
 917. σοί: MS. εἰς et Suid in Καλῶς.
 920. lege Εὐνεσίς τε καὶ [et sic Br.]
 922 et sqq. Στε. 1023 et sqq. Ἀντιστε.
 935. Citat Suid. Αὐτοπρέμνοις et Αἴμα
 943. Post Νιόβην adscripsit τινὰ Bentl.
 948. γὰρ: lege ἄρ' [sic Elmsleius in *Edinburgh Rev.* N. 37.
 p. 87.] vel γ' ἄρ'.
 961. dele ἦν [sic Elmsleius l. c. p. 85.]
 967. MS. ποῖά γ' [ut alii.]
 969. In Schol. scripsit Βηλα. i. e. *vela*.
 970. Ald. omittit μέν.—972. Suid. in Ἰσχανα.
 973. λευκοῖς MS. et Suid. in Ἰσχανα.
 974. In Schol. πτυσάνης. At Suid. πτισάνης in Ἰσχανα.
 ibid. ——— γράφεται δὲ καὶ ἀπηθῶν. Sic Etymol. in Ἰθμός.
 976. ἐκπεσὼν Scal.—983. τουτί: MS. τοῦτο [et sic C. apud Br.]
 989. MS. εἰθ' ὑποτοπεῖσθαι. Suid. in Καχυποτοπεῖσθαι.
 997. forte καρβανοπιτυοκάμπται vel στομφασμο—. Suidas ag-
 noscit Σαρκασμοπιτυοκάμπται.
 998. οἰμὲ, Suid. in Κόμψος.—1010. τοῦτ' lege τόδ'.
 1012. Suid. Αἴκε πάθοι.—1014. ζητῆτε Suid. in Ἰούστ' μ' ἦ.
 1018. lege σκορόδιον —1019. MS. ἐλαίας. Suid. τὰς ἐλάας βίς.
 1020. Suid. in Ἀβελτ—Βουταλιων et Μαιμμακ—habet ἀβελτερώ-
 τατοι: et MS —τεροι.
 1021. μαυμάκνυθοι Suid. in Μεταγένης.
 1024. lege Σὺ σέ: mox forte legendum μόνον ὅπως μνημονεύσης
 ut respondeat Strophæ.
 1029. ἀντιλέξης Suid. in Ἰστίοις et Λεῖον.
 1031. lege ἰστίοις: et sic Suid. l. c.
 1035. In Ἰστίοις Suid. καθεστῆκοι λάβοις.
 1051. MS. σὺ τί δράσας αὐτοὺς οὕτως ἀνδρείους ἐξεδίδαξας. [Vid.
 Bentl. Epist. ad Mill. p. 19. ed. Cant. 470 ed. Lips.]
 1053. lege θήβαις ut hodie titulus est. sed Eustathius, p. 1218.
 Bp. θήβας.
 1058. τοὺς omittit MS. recte si legas ἐξεδίδαξα [sic Porson Præf
 Hec p. 55.]
 1060. forte legendum ἦνικ' ἀκούσας περὶ Δαρείου τοῦ τεθνεώτος
 Ὁ χορός γ' vel ἦνικα γ' ἤκουσεν Δαρείου—Darius enim magnam
 dramatis partem loquitur et Chorus tum iῶ οἱ δὲ lamentatur.
 1060. Suid. Ἰαυοῖ σχετλιστικὸν ἐπὶ ῥήμα.
 1067. τοῦθ': lege τοῦδ.—1068. ΔΙ. sed MS. ΕΤ.
 1076. MS. εἴθ': et delet ἀν. forte Οὐδ' εἰ οἶο' εἴθ' ἦντιν* ἐρῶσαν.
 1077. MS. μηδέν σοι.
 1078. MS. ἐπικαθήτο. [Vid. Elmsl. ad Heracl. 283.]

1079. lege *ΔΙ*. ὥστε γε. et mox dele *ΔΙ*.

ibid. MS. κάτουνάβαλεν.

ibid. Vid. Pac. 700. [ubi Bentl. vult ἐσέβαλλον collato ibid. 745]

1082. MS. γενναίας καὶ γενναίων [sic alii.]

1083. lege πῖν [sic MSS.]—1084. lege τοῦτον [sic MSS.]

1087. τοῖς δ' ἡβῶσι ποιηταί: lege vel τοῖσιν δ' [et sic Fiorillo (rectius dictus Furville) ad Herod. Attic. p. 151.] vel τοῖς ἡβῶσιν δὲ ποιητὰς Πάνυ δὴ διί.

1089. forte Παρνήθων.—1091. γε omittit MS.

1095. lege ἐλαινοί [sic probante Porsono Præf. Hec. p. 8.]

1096. Sic distinguit Bentl. ἐβλαψά τι δράσας; [sic Reisk.]

1101. ἀπεφανάνθη Suidas: sed in serie sua Ἐπαφανάνθη. lege ἐπαφηνάνθη.

1137. ἀναδάσθον: sed syllaba brevis esse debet. lege ἀναδιαί-
γετον. [His conjecturis proximæ sunt Dawesianæ ἀναδάσασθον et
ἀναδιαίρετε.]

1150. leg. σοι [sic MSS.]—1153. MS. ἀσαφές.

1155. fortè Ὁρεστειάς [sic MSS.]—1161. MS. ταῦτα πάντα.

1178. MS. μάλλον.

1188. lege ἦκα [fortasse ex Gellio. xiii. 24.]

1192. lege ταῦτόν ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἐτέρως. MS. et ed. vet. ταῦτ' ἐστ'
ἀλλ' ἀριστ' ἐπῶν.

1194. Εἰς γῆν μὲν ἐλθεῖν Suid. in Πικω.—1204. lege λέγε.

1209. ἴδοις Suid. in Στοιβή.

1211. μούστιν, pro μοι ἐστιν. Suid. ὅς γὰρ μούστιν· ἀλλ' ἀκουσ-
τέα. τὸ τέλειον· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλά μοι ἐστιν ἀκουστέα· ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνυ γάρ·
Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατραχίοις· καὶ ἐν Ἰππευσιν (v. 1202.) Ἀπὸ· οὐ
γὰρ ἀλλά τοῦ παθόντος ἡ χάρις. Vid. Eq. 996, 1088. [addi
poterat v. infr. 1446.]

1213. MS. εὐδαίμων.

1215. πρὶν μὲν ἢ φῦναι Ἀπόλλων· MS. πρὶν φῦναι μὲν· lege ὦ
πόλλων.

1229. κατ' ἔπος δὲ Suid. in Ἀπὸ Ληκυβίου.

1250. Ληκυβίου. N. B. et cæsura est et casus nominativus ante
ἀπώλεσεν venit. Ληκυθ—est casus accusativus.

1251. lege τί ἐστ'; mox dele γε post τοῦτο.

1270. MS. ἔασον [ut C. apud Br.]—1271. MS. πολύβοτον.

1283 et sqq. Duo systemata trium versuum.

1283. f. ἐγῶν vice ἐγῶν·—1285. γ' omittit MS.

1287. νῦν ὄντων: lege νυνί: vid. 1120. ὑπ' ἀγυμνασίας ἔτι νυνί
[sic Gaisfordus ad Hephæst. p. 303.]

1281. MS. μέμψεται [ut alii] mox lege τουτονί.

1290. forte ἀνάκτορα Hesych. Ἀνάκτωρ.

1294. Post προσαυλεῖ additur τις in MS. et Suid. in Διούλιον.

1296. MS. habet σχολ. ιστίον ὅτι τὸ ἰήκοπον οὐ πελάθεις ἐπ'
ἀρωγῶν παίζων πανταχοῦ ἐπιφέρει κυρίως ἐκείνων τῶν Ἰαμβείων ὃν τοῦ
φθιώτ' Ἀχιλεῦ.

1316. *AI* lege *AI*.—1318. MS. ἔβας [ut alii.]
 1323. MS. χερσὶ καὶ δορύ.—1329. MS. συγκαλινέ τ'.
 ibid. In quibusdam exemplaribus h. v. deest. Vid. Schol..
 1335. MS. ἱερὸν [ut alii.]
 1337. *Μελίτου*: MS. *Μιλήτου*: lege *Μελήτου*. et sic Athenæus
 xii. p. 351. [ubi *Μελίτος* Schweigh. contra MS. A.] mox dele
 καί: et sic Suid. in *Μελίτος*.
 1342. ταῦτ': MS. τάδ' ἐστ' [sic MS. Vat.]
 1349. MS. Iacrus.—1364. σοι Scal.
 1366. Suid. *Κελαινεφάης*.—1385. lege ὀρεσσίγονοι.
 1410, 1. Ex his duobus efficitur senarius.
 1412. γὰρ ἀγαγεῖν: Inserere αὐτόν. vel τοῦπος ut in 1428 et 1435,
 vel κατ' ἶπος ut 1454. [MSS. 3. apud Br. αὐτόν.]
 1423. lege ἐπιθόμην [ut MSS.]
 1447. *AI*. lege *AI*. mox 1448. est ex ore *AI*.
 1450. Bentl. citat Schol. Phœn. 1201.
 1455. dele comma post γυνή: notat. τὴν κισαίδαν Cephaloso-
 phontis.
 1464. dele δὴ: mox lege οὖν ἄν. [sic MS. apud Br.]
 1475. μέγα: Suid. μέγαλα in *Σίξνιοι*.
 1485, 6, 7, 8, 9. Lines uncinis circumdedit Bentl. [Vid. Schol.]
 1496. Suid. in *Σαφίστερον* habet χρησαίμεσθα σαθείμεν ἄν. [sic
 Dawes. p. 243.]
 1500, 1. Hæc pro spuriis rejecit Bentl. [Vid. Schol.]
 1514. γ' addit Suid. in *Περικλῆς*.—1525. Suid. Τίς δ' οἶδεν.
 1526. In Schol. τοῦτο ἐξ *Ἰππολύτου*: lege *Πολυίδου*. vid. Schol.
 ad Hippol. 191. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν *Πολυίδω*.
 1552. τοῦτο et τοῖτοι Suid. in *Πλούτων*.—1553. lege τοῦτοισιν.
 1554. post ἔκωσιν addit ἐγὼ Suid. in *Δειγό* [sic Toup. ad Suid.]
 1563. θρόνον: κη θάκον [sic Br.] MS. Vat. θῶκον.
 1564. lege καὶ μοι σώζειν [sic Tyrwhitt. in Not. MSS.]
 1574. lege τοῖσιν ἑαυτοῦ.—1575. lege μόλποισιν.

ON THE 77th VERSE OF THE HIPPOLYTUS.

Σὺ τίνος πλ-κτὸν σ. ἴσανον ἐξ ἀκράτου
 λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
 ἐνδ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοὶ φέρβειν βοτὰ,
 οὐτ' ἤλθε πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκράτον
 μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἥρινδον διέρχεται,
 αἰδῶς ὃς τοταμίαισι κηπέυει δρόσοις. HIP. v. 72—7.

Amid the discussions, which have found their way into your *Journal*, on this celebrated passage, I have seen no notice taken either by Mr. E. H. Barker, or by any other critic, of the opinion

of Jacob Bryant, whose version of the passage is not altogether unworthy of attention:—

“An allegorical personage watering the meadow seems to us a very idle conceit. Were it a garden to be really watered by a supply taken from the river, *Αἰδώς*, or *Modesty*, for the modest votaries of the Goddess, might be more tolerable. But here all is the work of nature, and the morning [*ἔως, ἥως, αἰώς*,] is very naturally supposed to draw up his dew from the river. We have another authority for this reading, which no critic has yet cited. Mr. Bryant, in a beautiful Ionic Temple in Blenheim gardens, supposed to be dedicated to Diana, with this inscription—

ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ ΑἴΨΑΙ ΙΑΣΙ ΟΡΕΣΤΙΑΔΙ,

has inscribed the six first verses of this speech of Hippolytus with the reading *ἥως*, to which he has subjoined the following very elegant translation—

To thee, bright Goddess, these fair flowers I bring,
A chaplet woven from th' untainted mead,
Thy cool sequester'd haunt; where never yet
Shepherd approach'd, where the rude hind ne'er heav'd
Th' unhallow'd axe; nor voice nor sound is heard,
Save the low murmuring of the vernal bee:
The day-spring from above the dew distills;
Genuine and mild, from the pure stream exhal'd
On every fragrant herb, and fav'rite flower.

The version of this eminent Scholar is thus a comment, as well as a translation.” *Review of Egerton's Edition of the Hippolytus in the Brit. Crit.* for April, 1797. p. 428.

THE GALLANTRY OF SALADIN AND HIS BROTHER MALEK ADEL.

By Mr. HAMMER.

THE names of *Salaheddin* and *Melek Adel* are of the highest celebrity in our ancient Chronicles of the Crusades, and in the historical romances of our own times. They are represented by historians as two great Princes, who inspired terror among the Crusaders by the rapidity of their victories, and gained the hearts of all by their generosity towards those whom they had conquered. In this respect their renown is too well founded to admit of any disbelief; and those aspersions which the spirit of hatred and fanaticism has cast on the memory of Saladin, through some historians of the Crusades, far from tarnishing his true glory, only serve to weaken our faith in their veracity.

Not content, however, with the picture which History has drawn of the great and brilliant qualities of those princes, our romance writers have thought proper to embellish it; and instead of describing them merely as examples of generosity, courage, and magnanimity, they present them to us now as models of gallantry, delicacy, and chivalrous attention towards the ladies.

Saladin makes a figure in the amours of Eleonore de Guyenne, who nearly risked her own soul that she might save that of her Musulmañ lover; and *Malek Adel*, whose projected marriage with the sister of Richard Cœur de Lion failed through the intrigues of priests,¹ is become, thanks to Madame Cotin, the most tender, the most refined, the most transcendant of all chivalrous lovers; he is idolized by all women of sensibility, and he has reduced to despair all those men who feel that they are not capable of rivalling him in this amorous heroism.

Quite enchanted with the romantic virtues of this hero, and his success among the ladies, we have endeavoured to conciliate in some degree their approbation, by a diligent search in Arabian manuscripts; hoping to discover in these sources of history some new features, some exploits hitherto unknown, such as might inspire his fair admirers with fresh raptures, and confound the incredulity of all men who entertain any jealousy of his perfections. We must, however, acknowledge the unfortunate result of our labors—instead of radiant plumes with which we hoped to deck this Phoenix of Arabian cavaliers, our researches have produced nothing but disgraceful anecdotes, which reduce him to an heap of ashes, out of which he will not easily be regenerated.

We doubt if the ladies will give credit to our simple assertion—at most they will allow that Madame Cotin has exaggerated a little; but they will insist that she only added some embellishments to a groundwork of real chivalrous virtue. This was, at first, our own opinion; and having turned over a variety of manuscripts, without finding one anecdote in favor of Malek Adel's gallantry, we still persisted in believing him a perfect cavalier, in spite of this fatal silence of the Arabian authors.

But what was our astonishment on discovering, in a classical historian of those times, some facts which incontestably prove, that this famous *Melek Adel* was not only destitute of all the superior qualities which have hitherto been ascribed to him; but, on the contrary, that he, a ferocious soldier, and an unmerciful conqueror, was deficient in the slightest attentions paid to the fair sex, even in the country of harems and amongst barbarians; that so far from being the flower of Arabian worthies, or of having any pretensions to that title on account of his delicacy towards the ladies, he invariably treated women ill, and has always been considered among the Asiatics, as one who forgot, in the most interesting situations and circumstances of his life, what every man owes to beauty in distress!

¹ See "Abulfeda."

His brother *Salah-eddin* is equally guilty in this respect. History, whilst it does justice to their warlike and political merits, has, nevertheless, marked them as two barbarians who always failed on the most essential occasions, in the respect and kindness due to the fairest and the weakest portion of the human race.

But let History declare the facts:—according to an Arabian author¹—"In the year 581 of the Hegira, (of Christ 1185) *Salah-eddin* a second time laid siege to Mossoul. The chief of this city sent to him a solemn embassy, composed of his mother, the daughter of his uncle *Noureddin Mahmoud*, and other women, intreating him to raise the siege and spare their property; but he drove them back and refused to comply with their request; for which shameful conduct all the world blamed him the more, because the daughter of *Noureddin Mahmoud*, (a princess of illustrious blood among the chief families of this time, and to whose father *Salaheddin* owed many obligations) was one of the suppliants."

In seventeen years after this occurrence, the harshness of *Salaheddin's* conduct was punished in his own family, and the blow of retaliation fell upon his mother; but what renders the circumstance still more shocking is, that the blow was given by the hand of his own brother, the *Melek Adel* so undeservingly celebrated. The historian *Abulfeda's* words (according to *Ibn Emir*) are as follows:

"In the year of the Hegira 599 (of the Christian Era 1202) *Adel* deprived his brother *Afdhal* of the cities of *Sorouje*, *Raas-ain*, and *Quwatlan-nedjm*. *Afdhal* sent his mother to *Hama*, and requested that his nephew *Mansour* would send some person with her to wait upon *Adel*, and endeavour to obtain from him the restitution of his property. *Mansour* deputed to accompany the lady, *Zined-din Ibn Hindi*, the judge: but *Melek Adel* rejected her supplications, and sent her back in despair." "Thus," (observes *Ibn el Attier*, author of the book *Camel*), "was the family of *Salaheddin* punished for the misconduct of *Salaheddin* himself; on that occasion when the females of the illustrious house of the *Atabegs*, and amongst them the daughter of *Noureddin*, came, during the siege of Mossoul, and threw themselves at his feet without success."

What a sad discovery for the chivalrous glory of *Saladin*! and how unworthy does *Malek Adel* appear of the favors bestowed on his memory by *Madame Cotin*! Where we had reason to expect that he would prove himself another *Coriolanus*, we find him disgraced by misconduct towards the females of his own family, and branded with the eternal reproach of history.

This unfortunate discovery has given us much uneasiness—as we feel equally for him and for the ladies of whom he has been hitherto the favorite. We are sometimes rendered so happy by illusions, that it is unpardonable in History to come forward and destroy that *mentis gratissimus error*. We must only request of our fair readers on this occasion to be assured, that our researches have been directed to per-

¹ *Abulfeda*, Vol. IV. p. 66.

ronages truly historical, and altogether unconnected with the heroes of romance, those darling objects of female sensibility. Let *Saladin* and *Malek Adel* enjoy in peace the happiness which they can derive from the esteem of our ladies—they are no more the true *Salaheddin* and *Malek-Adel* than the *Mahomet* of Voltaire is the *Mohammed* of History.

RECHERCHES SUR APOLLON,

ET SUR DIVERS POINTS DE GRAMMAIRE, PAR J. B. GAIL,

Écrivain royal, Membre de l'Institut, et Chevalier de Saint Wladimir.

Recherches sur Apollon λύκειος, λυκοκτόνος, λυκηγενής, λοξίας, τέλειος, etc., et sur divers points de Grammaire.

RIFEN de plus commun dans les écrivains anciens que de rencontrer à la suite du nom d'Apollon, les épithètes λύκειος, λυκοκτόνος et autres. Les savans eux-mêmes, à plus forte raison les commentateurs, ont beaucoup disserté sur cette matière, et ne me paroissent avoir rien conclu de satisfaisant. De nouvelles recherches peuvent-elles sembler oiseuses ? Je ne l'ai pas cru. Je propose en conséquence de nouvelles observations sur le sens de divers attributs d'Apollon, extraites d'une dissertation assez étendue que j'ai composée sur cette matière.

I Λ' ΕΙΟΣ ou λικαιος. On donne à ce mot diverses étymologies : 1.^o celle de λυκος *loup*, étymologie qui rappelle l'oracle d'Apollon, lequel avoit indiqué aux beigers le moyen de détruire les loups (Paus., l. 2, c. 9.); 2.^o celle de λύκη, *la lumière qui précède le lever*

* Λύκαιος, λύκειος, λύκιος. Le très-savant M. Belin (dans son *LUCIEN*, t. 4. p. 80.) juge le premier de forme dorienne; le second, de la langue commune; le troisième, altéré. Pausanias donne le premier, l. 2. c. 9. p. 133; le deuxième et le troisième, l. 1. c. 19 p. 44, 45; le troisième, encore, l. 2. c. 19 p. 152, 153. Sur λύκειος, voyez Pausan. l. 1, et Thesaur. antiq. græc. t. 7 p. 559 au mot λύκεια; II. Estienne, à λῦξ et λύκειος; Constantin, à λ'κειος; et Vossii, de idolatriâ, l. 2. c. 12.

² Subst qui est primitivement l'adj. tém. de λεύκος, blanc. Aussi, chez nous, le subst aube vient du femm. alba, blanche.

du soleil, le crépuscule du matin (Macrob. Saturn. l. i. c. 17). Mais il est probable que ces deux mots sont de même famille, et ont une commune origine : que λύκος vient de λύω, *crépuscule du matin* ; que la dénomination de λύκος loup, rappelle l'habitude du loup qui, au crépuscule du matin, va chercher sa proie. Oubliant que presque tous les animaux sont désignés par le son de leur voix, leur taille, la couleur de leur robe, leurs mœurs, leurs habitudes ;² oubliant cet usage, et la double signification de soleil et de loup renfermée dans λύκος,³ on aura, en raison de deux étymologies admises au lieu d'une, établi deux traditions⁴ sur le sens de λύκειος. Les uns y voyant l'étymologie de λύκος loup, et adoptant la fable de Pausanias, auront traduit, *Apollon destructeur des loups*. Les autres considérant qu'Apollon est éminemment le Dieu lumineux, le Dieu soleil, auront, avec l'ingénieux Macrobe, cru devoir rendre *Apollon Lycien* par *Apollon Dieu du jour*, ou *Dieu soleil*, et tel est le sens que je donnerois à l'invocation du héros dans les *sept Chefs contre Thèbes* par Eschyle, v. 146. sq. On y lit, καὶ σὺ, λύκει' ἀναξ, λύκειος γένου στρατῷ θαλῆ, et l'on propose, *Dieu, jadis destructeur des loups, sois aujourd'hui destructeur*

¹ Et λύκη, de λύω, *solvo, aperio*.

² Ainsi βῶς (le bœuf), le vaste; ὄνος (l'âne), le lent, le tardif; πτωχὸς (le lièvre), le paresseux, etc.

³ *Solem enim λύκων appellari, etiam Lycopolitanam Thebaidis civitatem testimonio esse* (Macrobe, cité par H. Estienne). L'analogie qui existe entre λύκος loup et λύκος soleil, expliquera pourquoi, en langue celtique (voy. la dissert. de M. Johanneau), le même mot, à peu près, a signifié loup et année.

⁴ Je ne parle ici que des deux traditions le plus connues. Il en existe deux autres. D'après l'une, les Athéniens dérhoient le surnom de Lycien, de Lycus, un de leurs héros mythologiques, duquel, à les en croire, les Lyciens de l'Asie avoient emprunté leur nom. Suivant une autre, fondée sur le texte de Sophocle (Œd. t. 212—217), ce que j'appelle le Dieu soleil, seroit le Dieu de Lycie (sentiment de Rochefort) ; et il faut en convenir, lorsque l'on réfléchit que, dans le même passage, Sophocle nomme λύκει' ἀναξ, et λύκεια ὄρεα ; que Diane se plaît sur les montagnes de Lycie, et que Diane est sœur d'Apollon, on inclineroit à croire avec un Scholiaste, qu'Apollon est appelé Lycien, ou parce qu'il est né en Lycie, ou par allusion aux honneurs que lui rend la Lycie. Mais le moyen de rapprocher cette quatrième tradition de celle qui voit le Dieu soleil dans Apollon Lycien, seroit de supposer que le nom de Lycien rappelle la consécration de la Lycie à Apollon, Dieu soleil, ainsi nommé, dit le Scholiaste précédemment cité, de ce qu'il fait succéder la nuit au jour.

de l'ennemi, ou sois digne de ton surnom de destructeur des loups. Ce sens reçu plaît assez à M. Visconti, qui me permet de le nommer. Mais, je l'avoue, avant de connoître son opinion, j'aurois préféré de traduire, *Dieu Lycien (Dieu du jour, Dieu soleil) montre-toi contre l'ennemi digne de ton surnom de Lycien.* Sous ce nom¹ Apollon à Athènes² étoit représenté portant un arc³ à sa main gauche, et sa droite replevée sur sa tête, montre le Dieu se reposant comme d'une grande fatigue : les traits partis de cet arc, et au siège de Troie,⁴ et ailleurs, avoient ôté la vie⁵ à des milliers de guerriers. C'est donc probablement ce Dieu soleil que le chœur d'Eschyle invoque, et non le Dieu destructeur des loups : c'est le Dieu soleil, le Dieu du jour armé d'un arc d'or,⁶ et d'invincibles traits, et non pas le Dieu destructeur des loups, que pareillement Electre⁷ a invoqué contre cet Egisthe dont elle a juré la mort.

Dans Œdipe roi, de Sophocle (v. 71, 212 et pass.), lorsque Thèbes désolée par la peste, invoque Apollon Lycien, peut-il être question d'Apollon tueur, ou destructeur des loups ? N'est-ce pas évidemment le Dieu soleil (Œd. T. 675), ce Dieu purificateur que le chœur invoque avec instance, et si souvent dans le cours de la tragédie ?

De ces deux versions, *Dieu destructeur des loups, Dieu soleil armé de traits*, la première peut très-bien se défendre comme religieuse et mystique,⁸ puisqu'elle se fonde sur une tradition de Pausanias. Mais à cette tradition populaire que cite Pausanias sans la discuter,⁹ et sans y croire peut-être, je crois devoir préférer celle qui enseigne qu'*Apollon Lycien* est synonyme d'*Apollon Dieu soleil*. La dernière seule inspira les poètes, les peintres et les sculpteurs ; et parmi ces derniers, cet artiste (νόος ἐς θεοῦς ἀεφθής), à qui nous devons l'Apollon vainqueur

¹ Voyez *Musée Français*, par M. Visconti, article *Apollon Lycien*.

² Ainsi qu'à Argos probablement, ou plutôt, je crois, à Mycènes (Soph. El. 5, sq.) : car, dans l'Electre de Sophocle, la scène est à Mycènes ; ce que n'admet pas H. Estienne (au mot λυκαίος) ; tandis que, dans l'Electre d'Euripide, la scène est à la campagne près d'Argos.

³ Lucien, dans son Anach. de Gymn. t. 2. p. 387, l'appelle τοῦ Ἀρκίου, au lieu duquel l'éd. de Florence donne λυκαίου, leçon approuvée par M. Belin.

⁴ Hom. Il. 1, 45. sq. ; 4, 93 et 119 ; et passim, Soph. Œd. t. 212.

⁵ On donne des traits non-seulement au Dieu soleil, mais encore à la lune, Voy. Œd. t. 216, sq. et son Schol. ib.

⁶ Soph. Œd. t. 212.

⁷ Soph. El. 1396.

⁸ Ainsi pense M. Clavier.

⁹ Pausanias en cite plusieurs, sans en garantir aucune.

du serpent Python, chef-d'œuvre fondé sur la fable qu'Apollon, Dieu soleil, avoit un arc et d'invincibles traits, dont il se servoit pour purifier l'air.

II. Λύκειος ἀγορά. D'après ces notions, et autres, λύκειος ἀγορά (Soph. El. v. 7) signifiera non pas, *place où l'on avoit mis la statue d'un loup en l'honneur d'Apollon* (explication donnée par Estienne, et adoptée par l'estimable M. Pl.) mais *place lycienne, consacrée à Apollon Lycien (Apollon, Dieu soleil)*.

III. Λύκειον γυμνάσιον. Athènes avoit trois Gymnases, l'Académie, le Cynosarge, et le Lycée. Le premier étoit dédié au héros Académus; le second, à Hercule; le troisième, le plus illustre de tous, à qui étoit-il consacré? *A Apollon tueur (intersector luporum, Est.) de loups, ou destructeur de loups*, me répondront deux savans; l'un d'après Pausanias, l'autre d'après les héroïques de Philostrate. Quant à moi, saisi de la belle idée de Λύκειος, *Dieu soleil, c'est encore à Apollon, Dieu soleil*, que le Lycée me semble avoir dû être consacré, et non pas à *Apollon, Dieu tueur de loups*.² Dans le premier Lycée de la plus fameuse des cités savantes, on invoqua sans doute, non pas un Dieu qui tue des loups, mais un Dieu qui éclaire.

IV. Λυκοκτόνος. On le traduit vulgairement par *lupicida (luporum intersector, H. Est.)*; mais encore ici, je vois le Dieu du jour. M. *, considérant que je dérive Λύκειος de λύκη, *la lumière qui précède le lever du soleil*, m'a objecté que si Λύκειος signifie *le Dieu du jour*, λυκοκτόνος signifiera *le Dieu qui tue le jour*; et qu'alors Apollon seroit le Dieu du jour et de la nuit; et sa remarque a paru, à quelqu'un, d'une sagacité rare. Mais mon explication ne présente pas la contradiction qu'on lui a prêtée: car, d'après Macrobe, j'ai traduit λυκοκτόνος, non pas, *Dieu qui tue le jour*, mais *Dieu soleil dont la présence efface cette blancheur qui précède le lever du soleil*.

V. Λυκογενής, ó. Surnom d'Apollon, à cause qu'un loup s'étoit montré à sa mère pendant sa grossesse. A cette explication donnée par H. Estienne (qui renvoie à Hesych. et à Eustathe), préférons celle de M. Belin, helléniste très-souvent ingénieux, et de l'illustre M. Heyne.

¹ Quand les eaux du déluge se furent retirées, la terre alors impure infectoit les airs. L'influence bienfaisante du soleil, ou, pour parler plus poétiquement, les flèches d'Apollon la délivrèrent du serpent Python, c'est-à-dire la purgèrent des exhalaisons meurtrières dont ce venimeux reptile étoit l'emblème.

² Sur le Lycée d'Athènes, voy. Lucien, l. 1.; *Phil. Jac. Crophii exercit. de Gymnasiis literariis Atheniensium*; et le *Lex. Xen.* qui le cite.

Ce dernier dérive l'épithète de *λύκη*, *ἡμέρος* (le point du jour) ; et voit dans l'épithète d'Homère (Il. 1, 101 et 119), l'antique notion d'Apollon, Dieu soleil (*notionem solis in Apolline antiquissimam : est enim sol manè natus, ut dies est ἡὺς ἡμεγένεια* : explication conforme à celle de Macrobe (cité par H. Estienne, au mot *λύξ*.), qui donne *γεννώντα τὴν λύκην, generantem exortu suo lucem*, pour glose de *λυκηγενέα*. Notons dans ce dernier passage, *λύκη* signifiant *la lumière*, en général. Mais n'oublions pas que dans un sens plus restreint, il se dit de la lumière du matin, du crépuscule du matin.

VI. *Λοκάβας*, ὅ, l'année. Encore dans ce mot, je verrois l'idée de lumière et de Dieu soleil ; et, renouçant à l'une des étymologies indiquées par H. Estienne, *παρὰ τὸ λύκων δίκην βαίνειν*, je lui préférerois celle de l'anglais Robertson, à *λύκον, id est solis βάσει*.

VII. *Λυκαῖον σήκωμα* (Eurip. El. 1274), Hiéron en l'honneur d'Apollon Lycien, ou d'Apollon Dieu du soleil. Cet Hiéron, en Arcadie, étoit consacré au Dieu du jour. Les Dioscures (Eurip., *ib.*) y envoient Oreste. Il étoit en effet naturel que le Dieu *Loxias*, par qui il avoit été criminel, lui offrit un asyle.¹ Le substantif qui accompagne *λυκαῖον* mérite bien une note. D'après H. Estienne et autres, on rend *σήκωμα* par *contrepois qu'on met dans la balance* ; mais pas un mot de sens que je donne à *σήκωμα*, lequel d'après mes idées sur les désinences² en *μα*, je croirois plus expressif que *σηκός*.³

VIII. *Λοξίας* ou *λοξίης*, ὁ, encore *Dieu du jour*. A ma version on m'oppose ce mot de Lucien,⁴ *semblable à ce Dieu qu'on appelle Loxias, tu ne dis rien que d'obscur*. Mais n'est il pas évident que de deux interprétations données à ce mot à double entente, le Voltaire de son siècle a dû, écartant la notion de *Dieu du jour*, préférer celle qui peint Apollon avec un ridicule, et qui convient davantage au genre caustique, mordant et irréligieux qu'il avoit adopté ? Que l'on saisisse donc avec enthousiasme l'idée d'Apollon, Dieu obscur, dans le sens de Lucien, je

¹ Eurip. El. 1266, *sq.* ; et l'Oreste du même, trag. 1645.

² Voy. mon *Traité des Désinences*, deuxième partie, p. 12.

³ Voy. mes *Observations historiques*, etc., p. 197.—Pollux (IV, 172) donne *σηκώματα ἀντιθεῖναι*. H. Estienne, au lieu d'expliquer la difficulté dans Pollux, se borne à citer la locution. Quant à l'annotateur de Pollux il propose *ἀντιθεῖναι, quæ ponderantur paria facere*. N'ayant pas le texte qui contient *ἀντιθεῖναι*, je ne puis que proposer conjecturalement, *ἀναθεῖναι, consacrer (σηκώματα) des hiérons (à des Dieux)* ; ou, sans rien changer, donner à *ἀντὶ* le sens de *en reconnaissance*.

⁴ Sect. à l'encun, t. 1, p. 534.

ne le trouverai pas mauvais : mais que l'on me pardonne de trouver plus inspirante pour les poètes et les artistes, et plus digne d'Apollon, l'épithète de *Dieu du jour* ; et, avec Macrobe, de dériver $\lambda\omicron\zeta\iota\gamma$ de $\kappa\omicron\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\lambda\omicron\zeta\iota\gamma$, le zodiaque. Au reste, je suis loin de juger absurde, encore moins d'accabler d'offensantes et dures personnalités (de pareilles manières me sont étrangères) les partisans de la version, *Apollon obscur dans ses oracles*. Les écrivains sacrés n'ont-ils pas dit du vrai Dieu qu'il étoit souvent *impénétrable*?

IX. Τέλειος. Cette épithète, m'a-t-on objecté, se donne généralement aux grands Dieux. Pour moi, je doute qu'elle doive avoir ce sens dans les passages que j'ai cités.

Ce mot signifiera, 1.^o *parfait*, sens facile et connu même des enfans. 2.^o *Qui ad metam flor is juvenilis* (et non *qui ad metam vitæ*) *perrenit* ; sens que dans mes premières études sur les divers attributs d'Apollon, je n'appliquois pas, et à tort, au Ζεὺς τέλειος d'Apollodore (l. 1, ch. 2). M. Clavier l'adopte avec raison, et avant lui, Lennep, expliquant le passage d'Apollodore, au mot τέλος. Τέλειος est un de ces mots dont le sens ne se détermine que par le contexte. Or, le contexte et les rapports logiques justifient le sens de M. Clavier, qui est celui de Lennep : *Jupiter fut nourri* (et non pas *élevé*) *par les Curètes du lait de la chèvre Amalthée, mais parvenu à l'âge viril, etc.* 3.^o Et c'est ici l'acception difficile, τέλειος signifiera, je crois, *le Dieu dont les oracles ont leur accomplissement* ; ou bien, *le Dieu qui accomplit, qui exauce, qui conduit une chose à sa fin*. Ainsi dans l'Œdipe T. de Sophocle, v. 1353, τελῶν, signifiera, non pas, *Apollo mala confect mea* (version de Brunck) ; mais, *c'est Apollon qui permet que mes maux s'accomplissent*, des maux prédits par lui contre l'assassin de Laïus (*ib.*, 232, sq.). C'est comme si Œdipe avoit dit, Apollon (τελῶν) est contre moi τέλειος.

Dans ce passage d'Eschyle (Ag., 982), où Clytemnestre adresse à Jupiter une prière à double entente, Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει, τέλειος ne signifiera certainement, ni Dieu parfait, ni Dieu qui est à la fleur de l'âge ; mais Dieu qui exauce, qui accomplit, qui conduit un vœu à son parfait et entier accomplissement. Clytemnestre (*ib.*, 1441) qui vient d'assassiner son mari, s'écrie : *Ecoutez mon serment, j'en jure τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς δίκην*. Brumoy et autres traduisent, *par la vengeance de ma fille*, et négligent τέλειον, épithète qui n'est nullement oiseuse, et qui signifie, je crois, *la vengeance accomplie* (*ultionem quæ effectum sortita est*) ; ensorte que τέλειος seroit passif ou neutre, tandis qu'il est actif au v. 982.

Φαέθων. Sophocle (El. 826), fait dire au chœur ému des malheurs d'Electre, où donc sont les foudres de Jupiter? où est ἥλιος φαέθων? On traduit, *ubi lucidus sol?* Pour moi, je croirois pouvoir donner à φαέθων le sens de brûler, et non celui de luire. Ce sens me plairait, non parce que Servius dérive φαέθων de φάος *lux*, et de αἶθω brûler, mais parce que l'analogie le conseille: en effet, la substance du feu et celle de la lumière étant la même, on concevra que φαέθων puisse signifier *le brillant, et le brûlant*. En outre de l'analogie que pourtant n'appuie aucun exemple, je croirais avoir pour moi le contexte, en partie, du moins. En effet, le chœur demandant au soleil un vengeur, doit penser moins à l'éclat du soleil qu'à ses feux, et à sa faculté de brûler et de châtier.

Dans les huit premiers articles que je viens de discuter, où l'on voyoit le Dieu (*lupicida*, ou *intersector luporum*, H. Estienne), *le Dieu destructeur des loups*, j'ai présenté continuellement *le Dieu du jour, le Dieu soleil*. On a opposé à mon opinion, celle des grammairiens, qui dérivent λύκειος, et λυκοκτόνος de λύκος *loup*. Nous avons répliqué que λύκειος et λυκοκτόνος dérivent non de λύκος, *loup*, mais de λύκη *lumière*; que λύκος signifie *loup et soleil*; que lorsqu'il signifie *loup*, il dérive uniquement, de λύκη *lumière*; qu'on avoit désigné les animaux par leurs mœurs et leurs habitudes; que la dénomination de λύκος *loup*, vient probablement de l'habitude où est le loup d'aller au crépuscule du matin ou du soir, chercher sa proie; que les images des loups qui existent à présent encore, dans les pays voués jadis au culte d'Apollon, ne prouvent qu'une soumission aveugle à une tradition erronée, une tradition acceptée d'abord par le peuple, et ensuite par les savans eux-mêmes; que cette tradition erronée se conçoit et s'explique aisément chez un peuple aussi ami des fables que le Lycien;² que la tradition que je défends, et qui rappelle *le Dieu soleil*, me paroît noble et inspirante; qu'enfin elle a pour elle le droit d'aînesse (*antiquissimam solis notionem*), ainsi que le remarque un savant d'une grande autorité, M. Heyne.

On conçoit pourtant que les deux acceptions aient trouvé des parti-

¹ Au crépuscule du soir (c'est-à-dire, *entre chien et loup*), au moment où la couleur du loup ne se distingue pas de celle du chien. Voy. H. Estienne à λῶξ et à ἀμφιλόκη; et Macrob. Saturn.

² La Lycie, dit le savant M. Belin (t. 3, p. 549, de son Lucien), avoit été le théâtre d'une infinité de fables.

sans ; que les écrivains d'une même époque aient adopté chacun en particulier la tradition qui lui plaisoit le plus, ou qui convenoit le mieux au genre de ses idées ; que les écrivains mythologues, par exemple, songeant à Apollon, berger d'Admète, aient vu dans *λυκοκτόνος* le Dieu destructeur des loups ; tandis que les écrivains astronomes, portant leur vue plus haut, auront préféré à une fable la tradition vraie qui avoit rapport à des idées astronomiques.

Dans la mythologie grecque, il existe quantité de faits qui ont une allusion manifeste aux opinions primitives sur les révolutions des astres. On a beau jeter sur elles un voile religieux, la trace de leur origine et de leur altération n'en est pas moins aperçue par les esprits attentifs et accoutumés à réfléchir sur les faits.

C'est ainsi que la fable du serpent Python, que j'ai déjà citée, rappelle, ou l'influence bienfaisante des rayons du soleil sur l'atmosphère qu'il purifie, ou peut-être tout bonnement le dessèchement de quelques marais.

J'ai déclaré ma préférence pour l'une des deux traditions ; je ne m'aviserai cependant pas de me fâcher contre l'opinion contraire, en réfléchissant que le sens de *λύκειος*, *λοξίας*, et autres, pouvoit être problématique dit temps de Périclès.

Un orateur Corinthien (Thuc., 1, 70, 5), dans son parallèle d'Athènes et de Sparte s'exprime ainsi : *τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἀλλοτριωτάτοις ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως χρεῶνται, τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ, εἰκειοτάτῃ ἐς τὸ πράσσειν*. J'ai traduit : *ils offrent à la patrie et leurs corps, comme des biens qui leur seroient tout-à-fait étrangers, et leur ame (γνώμη), comme un patrimoine qu'ils lui consacrent*. Un jeune littérateur blâme *animé*, de ma version latine, version conforme à la glose de M. Néophyte Douka, et il a tout-à-fait raison : car c'est des facultés intellectuelles (*mens*), et non de l'ame en général (*animá*,) qu'il est ici question ; mais il n'a pas également raison, lorsqu'il donne à *γνώμη*, le sens de *génie*. Ce seroit faire beaucoup trop d'honneur au peuple d'Athènes que de lui accorder (*en masse*, qu'on me pardonne cette expression), le génie qui n'est le partage que de quelques êtres privilégiés. Il n'a pas raison non plus, lorsqu'il voit dans *γνώμη* une allusion au génie des grands hommes d'Athènes. Thucydide qui dans le membre précédent (*τοῖς σώμασιν ἀλλ. χρε.*) parle de tous les Athéniens en général, n'a pu dans le membre qui suit, penser à quelques Athéniens en particulier. Voici au reste ma conjecture sur le passage de Thucydide. “ Les Athéniens, quand “ il s'agit de combattre pour la patrie, sacrifient leurs corps, comme

“ s'il leur étoit absolument étranger : mais quand il faut délibérer sur ce
 “ que l'on doit faire pour le salut de l'Etat, ils tiennent fortement à
 “ leur opinion (γνώμη), comme à un bien qui leur est propre.”

EXCURSION

Sur le γνώμη, attribué, à tort, je crois, à Hérodote, par deux
 savans illustres, MM. Larcher et Wytenbach.

Le γνώμη de Thucydide me rappelle le γνώμη que MM. Larcher et Wytenbach attribuent à Hérodote (1, 31), dans l'histoire de Cléobis et Biton. J'ai cru devoir rappeler et défendre, dans ma *Dissertation sur les Hicrons des anciens*, l'ancienne leçon ῥωμην. “ ῥωμην (dis-je alors, p. 182, *sq.*), que l'on rejette, et que cependant fortifie le voisinage de νεγνιέων, me paroît à préférer. Les hommes louent la force des deux jeunes gens (τὴν ῥώμην) : les femmes plus sensibles, leur bon cœur (ὁμοῦ τεχνων ἐκέρησε). Ainsi, Hérodote, donne à chacun des sexes le rôle qui lui convient. Lisez γνωμη (que je crois fort peu grec dans le sens de bon naturel), vous ôtez à Hérodote une beauté ; et de plus, vous lui attribuez une rédonance, puisque vous lui faites dire que les hommes louoient le bon naturel, et les femmes le bon naturel de Cléobis et Biton.”

Mes raisons ne furent point goûtées : elles furent presque traitées de paralogisme et d'hérésie littéraire. Mais elles recevront une nouvelle force du témoignage de Pausanias, qui (1. 2, c. 19, p. 153), rappelant l'héroïsme de Cléobis et Biton, lui fait un mérite, non de leur bon naturel (sens, je le répète, que je vois bien faiblement indiqué par γνώμη), mais de leur force (ῥωμη), mot qu'il fortifie encore d'ισχύος. ὑπὸ ῥώμης τε καὶ ισχύος.

Ἵποφρητης (l'une des épithètes d'Apollon), et ποφρήτης, sont-ils synonymes, me demande un élève de l'Ecole Normale, maintenant professeur ? Voici ma réponse.

I. Ἵποφρητης. Rochefort, t. 1, p. 16 de son Sophocle, le rend par prophète, et l'estimable M. Planche, par interprète de la Divinité. La dernière version se trouve conforme à l'interpretes Deorum de Camérier, cité par H. Estienne. Cependant en considérant la preposition ὑπὸ, je croirois plus exact de traduire, en parlant d'Apollon, par exemple, Dieu qui rend des oracles sous un autre (ὑπὸ), qui rend des oracles

que lui communique un Dieu supérieur. L'analogie conseille ce sens, et de plus des exemples le confirment. Qu'Apollon rendit des oracles, non d'après lui, mais d'après Jupiter, c'est ce que nous apprend l'ancien Scholiaste de Sophocle (Ed., t. 151): ὁ γὰρ Ἀπόλλων ὑποφύτης,¹ δοκεῖ εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου λαμβάνειν τὰς μαντείας, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκφέρειν: c'est ce que nous enseigne une autorité bien supérieure encore, celle de Sophocle lui-même, qui, parlant d'un oracle rendu solennellement par Apollon lui-même, s'écrie: ὁ δὲ οὐκ ὄρακ' ἔδωκεν (Soph., Ed., t. 151). Je viens d'avertir du sens de ὑποφύτης dans un cas déterminé. Peut-être, en d'autres cas, auroit-il le sens d'interprète: ce dont pourtant je doute, et doit peut-être aussidouteront ceux qui n'aiment pas plus que moi les à peu près. Le sens d'interprète (des oracles, par exemple), conviendra mieux (quelquefois) à προφῆτης.

II. Προφῆτης. Quelquefois, dit H. Estienne, προφῆτης sera pour ἐκφύτης. M'interdisant ici toute excursion philologique, je n'invoquerai que l'analogie, et je dirai: προφῆτης signifie prophète, qui prédit l'avenir (πρό); et comme ce prophète ne parle pas d'après lui-même, en le considérant comme parlant d'après une inspiration, je l'appellerai ἐκφύτης, mais ces deux mots ne sont pas, pour cela, synonymes, comme le prouve mon explication. Voy. M. Barthélemy, (Anach., t. 2, p. 441), sur le sens qu'on attachoit à prophètes.

CRITICAL NOTICE OF

COLLATIO VERSIONIS SYRIACÆ quam PESCHITO vocant cum Fragmentis in Commentariis Ephraemi Syri obviis instituta a M. Gottlieb Leberecht Spohn, Catecheta ad Edeam Petrinam et Societatis Philobiblicæ Socio. Lipsiæ 1785. 4to. pp. 28.

WE notice this work, partly on account of its rarity in this country, but principally because it contains some very valuable materials for a work which is much wanted; a correct edition of the Syriac version of the Old Testament with various readings.

¹ Apollon parloit d'après Jupiter. Donc il étoit son *verbe*, terme que j'ai employé dans mon Xénophon (t. 7, p. 320), mais que je dois condamner, 1.^o parce qu'il rappelle λόγος, mot consacré dans la philosophie platonicienne, mais que n'emploie pas le Scholiaste; 2.^o parce que ce mot étant consacré dans notre religion, ne doit s'employer ailleurs qu'avec réserve.

Respecting the general value of the version, there seems to be among the chief Biblical Critics but one opinion, which is, that it ranks among the best, as well as the most ancient: but its utility is unquestionably much diminished by the numerous corruptions of its text. Of all the versions, indeed, which are extant, the Septuagint and Vulgate excepted, it has been most exposed to corruption: and when it had passed through the dangerous period antecedent to the invention of printing, and appeared likely to meet with some skilful physician, who might heal its wounds, and restore it to its original sanity, it unfortunately fell into the merciless hands of GABRIEL SIONITA. In him were united all the disqualifications which could possibly join to unfit a man for the office of an editor: careless, ignorant, and conceited, he has altered some things from rashness, some from inattention, and more from ignorance: but fortunately, we possess in the Arabic version, which was made from the Syriac, a tolerably sure means of discovering his errors. The judgment of the late Professor Michaëlis (undoubtedly the best Syriac scholar of his day,) respecting Sionita was remarkably severe: in every page of his valuable grammar he speaks of him in the language of contempt.

In ancient MSS. as is well known to all who are versed in Palæography, the diacritical mark which distinguishes *Dolath* from *Rish* (ד — ר) is often omitted, “unde alius male puncta supplementibus multa varietas lectionis, maxime in nominibus propriis. Innumera scriptionis vitia hinc orta, socordiarque Gabriëlis Sionitæ accepta referenda, versionem Syriacant præsci fœderis in Polyglottis Parisiensibus et Londinensibus inquinant, ut in questione critica, fueritne nomen proprium Hebraice per ד an per ר scriptum, versioni Syriacæ, qualis nunc Gabriëlis culpa est, non solum non mediocriter sed plane nulla fides sit.”

Jud and Nun (נ — י) which differ merely in size, have also been frequently changed: “hanc ergo legem sibi rogent critici, si in codicis Hebraici lectione dijudicanda quæstio sit de litera Jod vel nun, nullam esse auctoritatem Syriacæ versionis, atque ex hac quidem sola ne lectionem quidem variam textus Hebraici, quæ Jod pro Nun aut Nun pro Jod habeat, comminiscendam; solus si incedat Syrus, merum sphalma librariorum esse. Nec in nominibus

* Michaëlis *Grammat. Syr.* p. 5. 4to. Halle 1784.—Hence Kennicott in a note on Chron. xk. 38. loses a part of his argument which is to prove that הַנְּרִי not הַנְּרִי is the true reading: he urges that the Syriac reads הַנְּרִי; but this authority is of no consequence, as we have seen above; הַנְּרִי is certainly the right reading, as the Arabic version proves by reading نَدْرُ: this too supports the Syriac, which, were it not for the consent of the Arabic, would not have the slightest weight: indeed in a question of this nature, they amount only to the authority of one.

propriis solum, sed et aliis in verbis idem mendum frequens, elegans nonnunquam et bonam fundens sententiam; sed tamen mendum. Jobi. v. 12. pro Hebraico יננב (*furtim allatum est*) Syriacum legens ܢܢܒ (*responsum est*), et xxx. 17. pro נקרו eroduntur vel erodunt vermes ossa mea, ܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ *gravia sunt mihi ossa mea*, prope certum habebit, Syrum ibi ܢܢܒ scripsisse, hic ܢܢܒ erodunt. Vetus quidem uterque error, in illo jam exemplo Syriaco commissus, ex quo Arabs Jobum vertit: est et bona sententia, elephantiasi enim laborantibus ossa ipsa gravia atque oneri sunt. Verum variam lectionem Textus Hebraici hic ex Syro exsculpere magnæ esset incogitantia, cum ך et ם Hebraicum figura sit dissimillimum, nec facile, ut in Syriaco, errori locus.”

In the MSS. from which the Syriac version was taken, the vowel points were generally omitted, and were only employed in such words as might have some want of perspicuity, were they omitted: Sionita, however, with immense labor, every where added them, in doing which, as might be expected, he has often made mistakes. “Vetere Testamento Syriaco si quis uti voluerit, hoc statim ante omnia statuatur, punctorum vocalium nullam omnino esse auctoritatem: e. g. Job. xviii. 17. ne putet Syrum tam fuisse vecordem, ut ܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ verterit ܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ *creaturam*, sed efferat ܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ *desertum*, ut et Arabs ex Syro ܡܢ ܥܝܢܐ vertit. Sic, et gravius, non cen-

tum, non sexcentis, sed innumeris locis a turpi editore erratum, nec tam inscitia, quam summa socordia.”²

These defects, however, do not diminish the value of the Version as it originally stood, and ought only to incite us to greater exertions to restore it to its original purity. For this work, the tract before us contains some very valuable materials, although mixed with some of the refuse which must of course exist in every collection of various readings.—The Syriac version might, we conceive, be restored to a state of purity with less labor than most other works of the kind: it has been seldom transcribed, because used in a very small tract of country; the MSS. therefore may be expected to be tolerably correct: an Arabic Version has been made from it, which will often point to the true reading as we have seen: and it has been cited by many writers, fathers of the Eastern church, whose works still exist, and when compared with the writings of the Greek Fathers, present an almost uncorrupted text. Ephraem Syrus, the most eminent of these, has left many Commentaries on Scripture, in the course of which he cites innumerable passages: Spolin, a very eminent German critic, has from

¹ Michaelis Grammat. Syr. p. 6.

² Michaelis Grammat. Syr. p. 25.

this source drawn many valuable readings : his researches; indeed, are confined to the first twenty two chapters of Isaiah ; but it is much to be wished that he had examined the whole of the version by this test.

In this country the tract is very scarce : the copy lying before us is the only one we have ever seen. As the Continent, however, is now open, we thought it might be useful to mention its existence : as it deserves a place in the library of every one, who would criticise on the Syriac version.

Since various readings of the Syriac version are so remarkably scarce and difficult of access, we take the present opportunity of adding a few, which were extracted by Professor Adler from a Syriac MS. of the Gospels, written in the year 548, and published in his *Versiones Syriacæ* (4to. 1789.). Schaaf's edition is the standard, with which he collated the MS.

Schaaf

MS.

Matt. i. 19. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
— 21. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 23. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
— ii. 6. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 9. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
— iii. 4. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ
— iv. 2. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 4. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 6. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 19. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 21. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ	ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ omittitur.
— v. 5. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 6. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 13. MS. ܐܠܗܐ & ܐܠܗܐ without Jud. final.	
— 17. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 19. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 20. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— ib. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 22. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 24. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 32. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 42. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ
— 47. ܐܠܗܐ	ܐܠܗܐ

Matt. vi. 1. $\mu \text{ } \omega$	$\mu \text{ } \omega$
— 3. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 5. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 13. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 21. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 30. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— vii. 3. $\mu \text{ } \omega$	$\mu \text{ } \omega$
— 11. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 12. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 13. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 1b. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 14. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 17. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 23. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$
— 25 & 27. $\omega \text{ } \omega$	$\omega \text{ } \omega$

Some very valuable readings of a Cod. Guelpherbitanus collated by Bruns, may be found in Eichhorn's "Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur," vol. xv. which frequently agree with those Adler has found in the Vatican MS.

AN ANSWER TO A LATE BOOK

*Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley,
relating to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus.*

TOGETHER WITH AN EXAMINATION OF MR. BENNET'S
APPENDIX TO THE SAID BOOK.

LONDON: PRINTED IN THE YEAR, 1699.

No. V.—Continued from No. XXI. p. 169.

*To the Author of the Remarks upon Dr. Bentley's Fragments
of Callimachus.*

V. Num. 128. Suppose it were read thus, $\alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, et silentes sedere, Hesych. $\alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \eta \sigma \nu \chi \alpha \iota$, $\alpha \phi \omega \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$. And the Pythagorean silence is too well known to be disputed. [P. 72.]

W. 'Twould be a dangerous thing for a person of that old Comic Poet, Philemon's, Constitution, to read such a piece of Criticism as this. [V. Lucian. *Μακροβ.* versus fin.] Or was it your design to print a Banter upon yourself? For had a man premeditated how to write learned nonsense, he could not have done it more effectually. The Fragment here spoken of is taken from A. Gellius, lib. 4. c. 11. who introduces it thus, *Opinio vetus falsa occupavit & convaluit, Pythagoram--* 'It hath been of a long time a current tradition, but false, that Pythagoras the philosopher abstained from eating the flesh of animals, and from beans.' 'Twas in conformity to this vulgar error, that Callimachus wrote these two verses.

Καὶ κῆρυον ἀπὸ χεῖρας ἔχειν ἀνώρτον ἔδεσθαι

Κάγω, Ἡθαγγεῖας ὡς ἐκέλευε, λεγῶ.

In the first of these lines the word ἀνώρτον is a manifestly false Lectiō, and makes no possible sense. So that there being a necessity of some correction, Stephanus gives it thus, ἔχειν [καὶ ἀναμῶν] ἔδεσθαι, Dr. Bentley thus, ἔχειν [ἀβιωτά τ'] ἔδεσθαι. These two corrections of the Dr. and Stephanus agree in exactly the same sense; and which offers the less violence to the Text, the eye may judge. After them both comes our judicious Vindicator with his correction. And what's that? why, ἀνεῶς τε ἔδεσθαι, et silentes sedere: for ἀνεῶς in Hesychius is ἔπουρος, silentes; and the Pythagorean silence is too well known to be disputed. But, good Sir, what signifies the Pythagorean silence to the Pythagorean abstinence, the only thing here spoken of, which you are content to drop as nothing to the purpose. 'Tis a wonder to me how such a piece of criticism should enter into an head that has brains in it. A. Gellius is producing a couple of verses directly relating to Pythagoras his supposed abstinence from flesh: by the help of your correction they no more relate to it, than they do to his golden thigh. What an easie thing were it for me here to ask you an insulting question or two! but I'll not be unmannerly.

V. I am sure ἀβιωτός in Dr. Bentley's sense is a pure Anglicism, and I cannot think that Callimachus pretended to our language.

W. Were I the spitefullest man that ever took pen in hand, I could not retort this accusation upon you. I must do you that justice to confess, that of all the books I have ever seen in our language, I never yet read one with fewer Anglicisms in it than yours. That the signification here given to the word ἀβιωτός is uncommon, Dr. B. owns; [Rara quidem, fateor, est ea verbi significatio: sed, &c.] but withal observes, that Callimachus was a great innovator in language; and that Suidas after the more common interpretation of the word, gives it this less usual one; ἀβιωτός, ὁ μὴ ζῶν. Callimachus therefore being a great innovator in language, and Suidas having manifestly some-where or other met with this word used in this sense; 'Tis not improbable, but that in writing his Lexicon he might have this very passage of Callimachus in his eye: an author whom he refers to more than once without express mention of his name, v.l. supr. et speciatim Suidam, v. παρακλῆς, conf. cum Dr. B. n. 48.

V. Num. 200. Dr. Bentley reads it, καὶ μόνος, &c. et solus adolescentum comedebat tutorem, (one of the worst of crimes and worthy the Dr.'s considering.)

W. What a biting parenthesis is here? Wit and satyr all over. But suppose a man should ask you the question; what thought, Sir, what meaning had you in your mind when you wrote it down? Could you answer him?

V. But suppose we read, καὶ Κρόνος αἰζώων ἔγρ. κηδ.

W. But suppose there be no such Greek word as αἰζώων, then I suppose we must not read it so. [αἰζώος there is, not αἰζώων. I question, whether αἰ be ever contracted into αἰ.] And if you cannot maintain your αἰζώων, then your Κρόνος falls to the ground of course, and with Κρόνος your Julius Firmicus, and with Julius Firmicus your known story of Saturn's devouring the immortal infants before they were a day old. And thus I think your second correction is as insignificant as your first was ridiculous.

To fetch in the rest of those learned observations of your own, I must return to the beginning of your indictment.

V. Dr. B.'s correction of Fulgentius Planciades was needless. [P. 35.]

W. That correction was none of the Dr.'s. The Dr.'s words are, viri eruditi emendant. So that if it was needless, those learned men are to blame, not Dr. B.: But why was it needless?

V. For why should he cite a faulty edition?

W. The Dr. cites it from the edition of Jos. Mercerus, Par. 8vo. 1613. which all men of learning esteem as the best edition of that author. Gothofred did well in correcting the sense of his author, but in supplanting his words, and making his own conjecture (though just) part of the text of his author, he exceeded the bounds of a commentator. The Dr. could have done the like upon Malela; but he better understood the laws of criticism. Another little shrivell'd observation you have here, at which I cannot afford to make a stop. Perhaps there's nothing in it.

If any bookseller's shop in town could present me with a page more fruitfull of mistakes than is your 38th and 39th, it must be Mr. Bennett's; but I'll defy even his to match you here. Passing by your unintelligible (I am sure 'tis so to me) story of that old edition (you are speaking of Hephæstion) and this last; and your idle cavil upon a scape of the Dutch Printer, in putting a ν for an υ, I come to your own remarks, or at least those which you espouse and make your own.

V. The Dr.'s quotation out of Terentianus Maurus was long since cited by Lactantius in his Notes on Statius his Thebais, [P. 38. Lib. 3. v. 479.] and much more correctly, and to better purpose, thus, Branchi meminit Terentianus de metris,

Hymnum Branchiadæ Phæbo.—.

W. Let the reader, if he pleases, see it at length in your book, and compare it with the Dr.'s out of Terentianus himself, n. 36.

Much more correctly, you say, and to better purpose. How a quotation could be more incorrectly given, and to less purpose, is scarce to be imagined. If any mortal can make either sense or grammar of it, as it stands in that Lactantius, I'll lose the whole cause.

V. For as the verses are now read, I cannot excuse them: Chronology itself cannot defend them. [P. 39.]

W. Chronology! — Stuff.

V. For Branchus could not sing an Hymn of Callimachus. [Ibid.]

W. Nor could you construe Terentianus, which therefore I'll do for you.

Nec non et memini, pedibus quater his repetitis,

Hymnum Battiadem Phœbo cantasse Jovique

Pastorem Branchum: quem —

Nec non et memini, and I also remember, Battiadem, that Callimachus, cantasse, composed, Hymnum, pastorem Branchum, an Hymn (called) Branchus the shepherd, pedibus quater his repetitis, with these

Choriambick feet four times repeated, Phœbo Jovique, in praise of Jupiter and Apollo. And though Chronology will not admit Branchus, who liv'd so many years before Callimachus, to have sung an Hymn composed by Callimachus, yet Callimachus may have composed an hymn in praise of Jupiter and Apollo, and given to that hymn, from 'tis probable, the principal fable of it, the title of Branchus. And of that very numerical hymn there is scarce any doubt to be made, but that this fragment was part, and probably the first verse, it being in that Metre Terentianus speaks of, and with express mention of Jupiter and Apollo.

Δαίμωνες; εὐ-ὕμνοτάτοι· φηβέ τε καὶ Ζεῦ Διδύμων-γενάρχαί.

Here's the Pentameter, which Hephaestion and Terentianus speak of, after the 4 Choriambics ending in a Bacchius.

V. Branchus, says the same commentator, [Ibid.] was a Thessalian. Branchus Thessalus fuit, dilectus Apollini — illic Branchiades Apollo dictus.

W. But here this same beloved commentator of yours is no less than twice mistaken. First, Branchus was not a Thessalian, but a Milesian: vide inter Historiæ Poeticæ scriptores Conon. Nariat. 33, & 44, and Bernartius in loc. takes notice of Lactantius (al. Lactantius) as the only authority for Branchus his having been a Thessalian. [Statii oper. Par. 4to. 1618, Vol. 1. p. 143.] Now secondly, was Apollo ever call'd Branchiades, though you will find it so in some Lexicographers and Epithet-mongers, into whose hands it first came from this Lactantius, and so pass'd downward by transcription. I find it in Hoffman, but Baudrand hath rectified this mistake. For Apollo to have been called Branchiades, or rather Branchides, he must have been the son, not the father of Branchus. For that termination — ιδης or — ιδης determines the Patronymick to the descendants. There was indeed an Oraculum called from the successors of Branchus Βραρχίδαι or Βραρχιδων: but Apollo, as related to that oracle, took his name from the place of it, Didymæus. As is imply'd in this very fragment.

V. I question not therefore, but that Branchiades is the better reading. [Ibid.]

W. And I as little question, but that the reading Branchiades is most ridiculously absurd.

V. It carries its own credentials with it. [Ibid.]

W. It carries its own confutation with it. It is against Grammar, Chronology, and common sense; has been long since condemned by Brodaeus in his notes on the Anthology, lib. 3. cap. 23. and by Nic. Brissæus Montevillarius in his notes upon the passage in Terentianus now produced, Paris, 4to. 1531. Never, I believe, approved of by any man before your self.

V. Nor is there any need of playing the corrector, and changing quum into quem. [Ibid.]

W. So much need of it, that without changing quum into quem (an easie change) there's no construing those lines.

V. And to this head I question not, but the quotation, p. 337. in the Dr.'s collection ought to be referred. [Ibid.]

W. And upon this point I question not, but that you are again as much as ever mistaken. For most certain it is, that that quotation cannot belong to this head. For this Poem called Βράγχος was all of it written in that sort of Pentameter just before mentioned, and therefore the quotation, p. 337. which is Hexameter, cannot belong to this head. As Virgil's Tityrus being all of it written in long verse, that cluster of short ones, sic vos non vobis — cannot belong to his Tityrus. Had you construed that Greek you transcribed to the press in the page just before, you could not have fallen into this mistake. Καὶ τῷ πενταμέτρῳ Καλλιμαχος δὲ ὍΛΟΝ ποίημα τὸν Βράγχον συνέθηκε, Δαίμονες ἐν—[P. 38.]

I think you have made me work enough in one page: what have we in the next? why another, I question not.

V. The book (Νόμια Βαρβαρικά) was written, (I question not) after the example of Aristotle, whose treatise under that title is cited by Varro. [P. 40.]

W. This is brought in for no other end or purpose, but to create in the reader a good opinion of your learning. And therefore purely for the humour-sake, I shall tell him that this learned remark is Scaliger's in his notes upon Varro, which our Vindicator, without naming his benefactor, has confidently made his own. And yet whether or no Varro did indeed cite any Treatise of Aristotle under that title, is still a question. The copies of Varro have it Nomina, and the Nomina is but a conjectural emendation of Scaliger, which though not improbable, yet is it not altogether unquestionable. See the fore-mention'd Maussaci Dissert. Critic. in Harpocrat.

V. Natalis Comes, n. 45.

W. I'll have no concerns with Natalis Comes, supr. [P. 45.]

V. Joannes Franciscus Trincavellus, -- Victor Trincavellus, -- Cardinal Bembo;—with a Tristich.

W. A Tristich, beginning with a short verse. sed vid. supr.

V. The Dr. hath, I doubt not, studiously omitted those entire epigrams which had been collected by [Himself and] others——

W. Here the [Himself and] is added in your second edition; the only instance I have observed in you of a second thought. But a strange kind of omission this, methinks; the omission of the epigrams collected by himself: and n.b. collected by himself: q.d. not by others, ergo the collection his own, ergo, not stole. Your meaning, I suppose, is, he studiously omitted the inserting these entire epigrams among the fragments, and, to conceal the fraud, placed the entire epigrams among the entire epigrams. Studiously, I doubt not. • This ought to have been referred to the class of transportations, *supr.*

V. A critick so curious in what did not belong to his poet. [P. 50.]

W. The name of Callimachus did belong to his poet: which name therefore being falsely ascribed to a wrong person, 'twas no unnecessary curiosity in the Dr. but full to the subject he was upon, to rectify that mistake: for which a man less litigious than your self would have thanked him.

V. The Dr. might have been so carefull as to have acquainted the learned world with what was genuine and presumed to be truly his author's. [Ibid.]

W. Which the Dr. hath amply done. But is that Latin epigram you are here speaking of in Mr. Juret's collection of *Epigrammata veterum* genuine, and truly Callimachus's? If you can have had any other meaning in this than purely the contradicting Dr. Bentley, it must have been a very silly one: and in that you all along come off so scurvily, I hope we shall hear no more of you. •

V. *Natalis Comes, Καλλιόπη σοφίην.* [Ibid.]

W. I tell you again, I'll have nothing to do with *Natalis Comes*.

V. Mr. Stanley having —— [P. 51.]

W. Here begins a paragraph, but where it ends I know not, nor how to construe it. 'Tis big of accusations against the Dr.

V. Mr. Stanley reckons the Dr.'s n. 142. among the fragments of the epigrams; which seems very likely.

W. But for what reason, sir, doth it seem so? I see none.

V. And that the title of this epigram was *ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντείου δοῦās*, as *Suidas* averrs. [Ibid.]

W. Whether your meaning be, upon the skin of a lion, or upon the skin of *Leontius*, (for either or neither of these you may mean, for ought I know) *Suidas* averrs neither the one nor the other. The Greek preposition *ἐπὶ*, sir, in this place signifies *de* (*de pelle*) not *in* (*in pellem*.) And all that *Suidas* averrs, is, that the word *σκύλος* is sometimes apply'd to the skin of a lion, or that the skin of a lion is sometimes called in Greek by the name of *σκύλος*. For which signification of the word he produces the authority of *Callimachus* in this fragment. This is all that *Suidas* means, sir, by his *ἐπὶ τῆς λεοντείου δοῦās*.

V. As his despised *Æmilius Portus* had corrected his author.

W. 'Tis no presumption in Dr. Bentley to despise *Æmilius Portus*.

V. Dr. Bentley takes it from Æmilius Portus. [Ibid.]

W. Dr. Bentley takes it not from Æmilius Portus.

V. Not to mention the Doctor's changing σκόλος into σκύλον. [Ibid.]

W. The Dr. does not change σκόλος into σκύλον. This fragment stands in two authors: in Suidas, and in the Scholiast on Sophocles. In Suidas it is given with the word σκόλος; and therefore with the word σκόλος from Suidas did Mr. Stanley transcribe it. In the Scholiast on Sophocles it stands with the word σκύλον; and so from him hath the Dr. given it. So that the Dr. did not change σκόλος into σκύλον, but as he found it in his author; so without any change at all he wrote it down.

V. Whereas both words are genuine.

W. And therefore the Dr. might use either of them. Qu. Is not this cavilling?

V. That the reader may judge whether the corrections, Ἀλητιάδαι, ἦ, Ἐφύρη, be Dr. Bentley's, [P. 52.] I will transcribe the Fr. n. 103. from the MSS. [MS. write like a scholar.]

Καὶ μὲν Ἀλητιάδαι ποῦλν χειρώτερον.

Τόρδε παρ' ———.

W. I do judge that Dr. Bentley took not those corrections from Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the Ἀλητιάδαι, the verse required that Lection, and I do judge that Dr. Bentley knew the rules of the Greek Prosody before he saw Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the other two corrections (ἦ and Ἐφύρη) the Dr. hath many very material variations from your MS. upon which variations from your MS. those two corrections altogether depend; in conjunction with which therefore they must have been made. The Dr. comes nearer to Junius his Lection, than to that of your MS. [Had Junii Animad. lib. 4. c. 21.] And therefore if we must suppose him to have been beholding to either of them, it was to the former. [Gruter, vol. 4.] The mistaken Lection of your MS. χειρώτερον, lin. 1. τόρδε, lin. 2. make its true Lection Ἐφύρη lin. last of no use, and in the same last line the Lection ἀγωνιστά, (as you have given it) can never be brought to bear either sense or construction. But the Dr. having established every one of his Lections upon reasons and authorities rendering them certain, hath thereby made all the parts of the fragment consistent, and given a very learned and perspicuous explication of it; which according to the Lections of your MS. could never have been done. So that upon the whole, my judgment is, that the Dr. was no more beholden to Mr. Stanley for his Ἀλητιάδαι, ἦ and Ἐφύρη here, than he was for his Ἐκάλη, δένδρεον and βουσσός before. [Supr.] But this is the way of you; 'tis but arming forth your pages with a set of Greek words against the Dr. and throwing them off with a confident turn; and so, with your readers, the work's done.

V. The reader is left [Ibid.] to compare the Dr.'s n. 71. out of Suidas, beginning with these words, — οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα, &c. with the same fragment in Mr. Stanley's MS. beginning with these words, ἡδέσθη δ'

οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα λέγον; and to pass his judgment upon the Dr.'s assertion, *Quæ antea corruptissima felicitèr nunc restituiamus.*

W. And my judgment is, that the Dr. had very good grounds for his assertion. Dr. Bentley's Lection comes much nearer to the text in Suidas: and there be almost as many flaws as lines in Mr. Stanley's. He begins with a too licentious inversion of the order of the words; his second line *Υἱὸν Λεωπεπτοῦ* — were there no exception lay against the grammar of it, runs, methinks, very heavy and unpoetical.

Υἱὸν Λεωπεπτοῦ κείσθαι τὸν Κρίων ἄνδρα.

The word *κρίωνων* would not make *κρανίωνος* verse fit, but *κράνωρος*. The conjunct *αἶψα* (so I suppose it should have been printed) seems in this place somewhat too impetuous for the verb *ᾤλισθεν*, to which it cleaves, besides that it is a farther departure from the text (*αἶψα*;) instead of which, the Dr.'s interjection of lamentation *αἶ αἶ* seems to be demanded by that expression of Suidas *ΟΙΚΤΙΖΕΤΑΙ Ἰκαλλίμαχοι τὸ ἄθεσμον ἔργον*, which I take to be as much as miserabiliter representat. What Mr. Stanley means here by his *μεγάλας σκοπάδας*, I know not. But Dr. Bentley hath given us a fair account of his *μεγάλους Σκοπάδας*. Such is the justice which is done to the names of the deceased, when their papers are put into the hands of them that know not how to use them. But 'tis no imputation to any man that his first thoughts are not correct.

Besides, Sir, if Dr. Bentley were such a plagiarist as you would have us believe of him, what a prize had here been for him? And why did he not make hast off with it, and forthwith to beating about again for more prey? That's the way of them that live upon the plunder. What another instance have you here given us of your unskillfull management? So often telling us of his transcribing your MS. ? So fully demonstrating how little he regarded it! The character upon which you spend the former part of your book, a most supercilious corrector, is not very consistent with what you give us in the latter part of it, a most notorious plagiarist. Who'd imagin both these belonged to the same man?

V. In n. 86. the correction of *Διωγόμενος Μήλιος*, was long since made to his hands. [P. 56.]

W. Nor doth the Dr. lay any claim to that Correction. But the observation that that fault in the copies of Plutarch had been of so long standing as to have misled Eusebius and Theodoret (the former of which Præp. Evang. l. 13. and the later Therapeut. Græc. Ser. 2. follow that corrupt Lection of *Διωγ. ὁ Μελήσιος*) and consequently the rectifying the mistakes of those ancient writers, this was the Dr.'s own.

V. And whether *Χάλασεν* be not a genuine reading, and *ψοφτεῖ* be not as likely as *ψήχει*, I refer him to Sam. Petit's Miscellan. observat. l. 1. c. 2. p. 9, 10. [Ibid.]

W. And I refer him to Richardus Bantleius, in not. ad Fragmenta Callim. num. 86. p. 340. For, Sir, do you think your so often saying, I refer the reader to, &c. will pass any where, but among yourselves, for a confutation of Dr. Bentley? Though this Sam. Petit being a

critick from whom as little is to be learn'd, as from any of those whose books have the good luck to bear a price, I am apt to believe you may have read him.

V. Callimachus may have written a Tragedy called Dædalus, of which Tragedy, this fragment, (n. 305.) may have been part. [P. 65, 66.]

W. No, Sir, that cannot be. But that you were resolved to be an author, you might, perhaps, have pass'd for a scholar. This fragment is part of an hexameter, a sort of metre which a very moderate antiquarian would have told you the ancients never made use of in Tragedy.

Ἐν δὲ λάχασσε μὲν ἔργα σιδήρου.

V. The Dr. n. 139. cites among the Fragmenta incerti loci, [P. 67.] that known passage out of Athenagoras, Κρήτες ἀνὶ ψευσταί. &c. which verses are no fragment, but part of that entire poem, Hymnus in Jovem.

W. This looks like cavilling. Athenagoras his Reflection upon Callimachus is not so vulgarly known, and for the sake of that alone did the Dr. I presume, produce this passage, πιστεύων Καλλιμαχε ταῖς γοναῖς, &c.

Besides these learned observations of your own, and your many judicious animadversions upon the mistakes of the Dr. you have been pleased to present the learned world with some farther discoveries by way of Supplement to the former editions of Callimachus. After my having been at such pains to disclose some of your failures, 'twere injustice to conceal your improvements. But before I come to them, there is another part of your charge against the Dr. not immediately concerning Mr. Stanley's MS. upon which I am obliged to bestow some few reflections.

Not content to have made the Dr. so notorious a plagiarist upon the account of Mr. Stanley's MS. you intermix here and there some proofs of plagiarism upon him from some other printed books. 'Tis resolved, I see, the Dr. shall be a plagiarist. The work is begun and it must be finished. [Mr. B. p. 143, 171, 183, and 54, 133, 216, 226, 233, 248, 261, 262, &c. Vid. et Dr. B.'s Answ. p. 213, 333, 383, &c.] If any of the same passages be to be found in any other books whatsoever, whether printed or MS. as in the Dr. from thence shall the Dr. have stole them. According to which method I challenge you, Sir, to name that modern writer, writing upon a subject wherein the producing the authorities of the ancients is necessary, whom I shall not (even without the assistance of a club, and with no more than one set of fingers to turn over books) prove a plagiarist. And yet this is the way of these gentlemen's (I'll venture to put it in the plural number) managing their controversie with Dr. Bentley. But as for you your self, sir, (such is your reading) you are very sparing of your instances of this kind; and in these few you do produce as obliging to the Dr. as heart could wish.

I took notice [supr.] of about 9 or 10 pages in Dr. Bentley's collection, small letter and close print, sc. from p. 327. to p.

337. for which only a little marginal reference in Mr. Stanley; the consideration of which I then postponed, and shall here take it up. It is indeed at first sight the most plausible thing against the Dr. in the whole indictment, and seems to make him directly beholden to Mr. Stanley for a little hint at least, though the working it out was left to himself. Were I at a loss for an answer here, our Vindicator (which, I thank him, he seldom fails to do) hath supply'd me with one. [P. 54, 55.] But I need not crave his assistance. The case is this.

In Mr. Stanley's MS. over-against the title *Θαυμασιων*, in the margin, stands, Meurs. in Antig. c. CXLIV. That chapter in Antigonus begins thus. *Πεποίηται δὲ τινα καὶ ὁ κνήρη-δὸς Καλλιμαχος ἐκλογὴν τῶν παραδόξων ἧς ἀναγράφομεν, ἃ ποτε ἡμῖν ἐφαίνετο εἶναι ἀκοῆς ἄξια*; i. e. Callimachus of Cyrene hath made a collection of things strange and wonderfull, the most remarkable of which I shall transcribe. And so he begins his transcribing, *Φησὶν Εὐδοξὸν ἰστορεῖν ὅτι, &c.* He (Callimachus) saith, that Eudoxus relates that, &c.

Now upon this Mr. Stanley had made this remark. Quibus ex verbis omnia quæ sequuntur usque ad finem libri ex Callimacho deprompta esse conjicere licet; i. e. From which words one may conjecture that all that follows in Antigonus to the end of the book is taken from Callimachus. And good reason had he so to conjecture; for Antigonus in his cap. 144. entering upon transcribing from Callimachus, and it not appearing (his book being imperfect) where he ended, the inference is very fair, that all that follows in that book, as it now stands imperfect, is taken from Callimachus. An instance of the same kind we have before in the same book. Antig. c. 32. *Καὶ μὴν τὰς τε λοιπὰς ἐντρεχείας τῶν ζῶων—ἀκριβέστατ' ἂν τις ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους συναγωγῆς καταμάθοι, ἐξ ἧς ἡμεῖς πρῶτον ποιησάμεθα τὴν ἐκλογὴν*, cap. 33, *φησὶ περὶ κωνώπ.* &c. i. e. 'The several other wonderfull sagacities of certain animals one may find most accurately described in the writings of Aristotle, out of which, before I go any further, I shall make this following collection. cap. 33. He saith that the wolves about the Lake of, &c.' And so he goes on still transcribing out of Aristotle to cap. 127. which he thus concludes, *Πολλῶν δὲ ὄντων ὧν καταέγραψεν Ἀριστοτέλης*, &c. i. e. 'But Aristotle hath left behind him many books, out of which what I have here given is all that I could at present recollect.' And so he breaks off his transcribing out of Aristotle. After the same manner doth he begin his collection out of Callimachus, c. 144. But where he ended, his book being imperfect, we know not. Therefore saith Dr. Bentley, p. 328. et profectò ut omnia, quæ deinceps, &c. 'As all that is in Antigonus from cap. 32. to cap. 127. is transcribed from Aristotle, so all from cap. 144. to the end of the book is taken from Callimachus.' And accordingly all those passages he transfers into his collection. Upon which our Vindicator cries out shame upon him. 'I cannot acquit him,' saith he, 'either of being vain-glorious, or a plagiarist, when he avers (as 'tis true he doth) that he himself was the first who restored those noble fragments to their true author.' For how can Dr. Bentley have

the face to say, that he was the first, when Mr. Stanley had observed it before him. But had Mr. Stanley also observed the like of Aristotle? But to let that drop. Pray, sir, will you please to read your own words immediately following your transcription out of Mr. Stanley. Quibus ex verbis, &c. And with Mr. Stanley agrees the learned Johnsius in his second book of the Writers of Philosophick History, cap. 12. p. 176. [P. 55.] If therefore Johnsius had observed it as well as Mr. Stanley, then Mr. Stanley was neither the first man nor the only man that had observed it. And why may not our learned critick (a title, which, since some books lately publish'd against him, no man will deny to Dr. Bentley) have observed it without the help of Mr. Stanley's MS. [P. 61.] as well as had the learned Johnsius, whose right to the same title is as little disputed? But in the words immediately following, [P. 55.] and in several other places of your book, you tell us over and over, and that very emphatically, that the Dr. had thorowly read that piece of Johnsius. [P. 61. et seqq. Mr. B. p. 142.] You have over-done your work, sir, and laid the indictment in two places. The unhappiest man at managing an accusation, that ever took such a piece of work in hand. Pray, sir, will you please to certify the world in your third edition, from whom did the Dr. take this hint first? Did he take it from Johnsius first, and afterwards from Mr. Stanley? or first from Mr. Stanley, and afterward from Johnsius? This, sir, is a point upon which you ought to be very determinate, [P. 76.] the province you have taken upon you obligeth you to restore every paragraph to its right author. And therefore you must let the world know precisely, if Dr. Bentley's name must be expunged, whose name must be put in the room of it in the next impression of Callimachus: [P. 74.] whether Mr. Stanley's or the learned Johnsius. For without a more particular information than you have yet given, Mr. Grævius will not be able to do justice between them.

But I'll maintain the Dr.'s right. His name must not be expunged out of the next impression. I very confidently presume the discovery was of the Dr.'s own making, and (not to flatter him) 'tis one of the meanest in his whole book. Antigonus himself had laid it so full in view, that no body, reading him with attention, especially having that Greek poet, Callimachus, in his thoughts, could have pass'd it over unobserved. Let the reader cast his eyes back upon the πεποιήται δέ τινα — and the φησίν. Callimachus made a certain collection—he saith that — now, sir, dip upon what chapter you will in Antigonus after c. 144. to the end of his book, (abating here and there an intersection of the collector's own, easie enough to be distinguish'd from the rest) you will find this φησίν either express or subintellect before the infinitive mood: for the Dr.'s correction of Θεόφραστος into Θεόφραστον, c. 145. and of ἰστροῦ into ἰστροεῖν, c. 147. with others of the like kind, I suppose no body (unless perhaps your self) will dispute with him: And that φησίν must have some Nominative Case, and that Nominative Case can be no other than Καλλιμάχος. So that the utmost of the Dr.'s discovery here was only finding out first the principal verb, and the then Nomi-

native Case to it: which 'tis a strange thing if he could not have done without the help of your MS.

But why then is the Dr. so vain glorious upon his performance here if it was so easie a thing? [P. 54.] *Haud malè, opinor, de Callimachio meritus sum, qui primus tam luculenta ἀποσπαράγματα illi restituo.* 'I think Callimachus is not a little obliged to me for being the first who restore to him so fair a quantity of fragments.'

Because the thing is true. For how obvious soever the discovery might lie, yet no body having before given the publick any notice of it, (no not, in express terms, Johnsius hims'lf) or taken care to restore these fragments to their true author: to the Dr. alone doth Callimachus owe his obligations. Besides which, Callimachus is not a little obliged to the Dr. for the commendable pains you your self acknowledge him to have bestow'd upon these fragments; [Ibid.] for his having restor'd them to their genuine Lection, and for his having justified our poet's narrations from the concurring testimonies of so many other good authorities. And if you will please to look over the many improvements which (after the learned and accurate Meursius and Xylander) the Dr. hath made upon that part of Antigonus, you will find that he might well think Callimachus not a little obliged to him, and that I spake within compass when I said before, [Supr.] bringing this very instance for a proof of it, that in many places for one single line which you alledge against the Dr. as stoln from Mr. Stanley, the Dr.'s additions are more than twenty to one. As in this present case is very manifest, taking in your marginal reference in its utmost extent.

Ay, that's true indeed, in this place. But to whom is the Dr. obliged for all this? To the learned Johnsius, who advised his reader to consult Stephanus, Pliny, and Suidas. [P. 55.] And 'tis plain by the comparison, that Dr. Bentley followed his advice, though he will not own his kindness.

As much as to say; that Dr. Bentley would never have read Stephanus, Pliny, and Suidas, had not the learned Johnsius put him in mind of it, that there were such books in the world, and that he ought to read them. For this advice and advertisement is it that the Dr. is so deeply obliged to the learned Johnsius, and (ungratefull man as he is) hath not told the world who told him of those books.

'Tis plain, by the comparison, you say, that the Dr. follow'd his advice. That is, to a man that will read over the Dr.'s Collection it will plainly appear, that the Dr. hath read Stephanus, Suidas and Pliny. As for Stephanus and Suidas we have had enough of them already. [Supr.] But hath the Dr. read Pliny too? Yes, 'tis plain, you say, he hath. Now, pray, sir, turn to the 83d page of your book, and there you do as good as say the Dr. hath not read Pliny. For the Dr. having produced several passages out of Pliny, as n. 392, 393, 394, &c. Harduin's Indices, say you, directed Dr. Bentley to these quotations out of Pliny, q. d. Dr. Bentley did not meet with these quotations in Pliny himself, but just turned to the Index

Authorum, v. Callimachus, and so came by them. But if the Dr. follow'd Johnsius's advice, and turned over Pliny himself, as 'tis plain he did; what need was there of running to Harduin's Indices? 'Tis a plain case, sir, from the beginning of your book to the end of it; that you know not, or matter not what you say, so that you can but fling out somewhat against the Dr. And this is the way of all of you. Calumniare fortiter, is the rule you go by. But there should be a little wit in it. I wonder how your book comes to bear a second edition. In p. 65. I find you upon Harduin and Pliny again. His quotation out of the Scholiast upon Apollonius Harduin in his notes upon Pliny supply'd him with. Ridiculous! as if the Scholiast upon Apollonius himself were not sooner read over than a Pliny with Harduin's notes, or as if that were the only quotation out of the Scholiast upon Apollonius in the Dr.'s collection. [Vid. *supr.*] But that quotation is not in Harduin's Index. So that all that is in Harduin's Index, from the Index the Dr. stole it: but what is not in the Index, for that he is oblig'd to Johnsius, who advis'd him to read over Pliny himself, which advice, 'tis plain, the Dr. followed. Are you not ashamed, sir, of putting such stuff as this into print? I do not answer these things, as if they deserved an answer, but to let the world see how these men manage their controverſie against Dr. Bentley. The Dr. must have what is in the Index, or not have what is in the author, *vid. supr.*

But you are a person as unlucky in your memorandums, as you are inconsistent in your allegations. Let me lay down this as a rule: 'tis not for a young writer to despise an Index. 'Tis but comparing the author of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris examined, p. 164. with Dr. Bentley's answer, p. 229. And with the Index to a very common book, *Ælian. Var. Hist. libræ x.* and you'll find out my meaning.

V. The quotation out of the learned Scholiast upon Aristophanes, n. 101. was ready brought to his hands by the editor of Aristænetus his Epistles, ep. 10. p. 229. [P. 57.]

W. I had reason to observe of you, that you are the most unhappy man to your friends, and the most obliging to your adversary that ever took pen in hand.

The Dr. stole his quotation out of the Scholiast upon Aristophanes from the editor of Aristænetus his Epistles.

Ans. 1. Compare your learned patron, p. 31. Marg. with Dr. B. Answer, p. 21. and Mr. B.'s p. 164. again with Dr. B.'s answer, p. 229, 230. and you will find that the Dr. was too well acquainted with the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, to have borrowed his quotation out of that Scholiast from the editor of Aristænetus.

2. The Dr. in this very place rectifies a mistake of that learned Scholiast, which the learned editor of Aristænetus transcribes into his annotations without taking any notice of it. So that you have here marked out an instance for the reader to reflect upon; that the Dr. how notorious a plagiarist soever, yet he is none of your pedantic critics, a literatim transcriber of other men's mistakes, and making them

his own. The Dr. is able to correct the faulty opinions of the Ancients, as well as the faulty copies of their works.

3. The Dr. also rectifies a little mistake of that learned editor of Aristænetus (Josias Mercerus, sir, the father-in-law to Salmasius) who misquotes this piece of Callimachus under the title of Acontius, whereas it should have been *Κυδίππη*; as the Dr. from the authority of Ovid establishes it. And that I put the reader in mind of this other second little advantage, which (as to this particular) Dr. Bentley hath over the learned Mercerus, is owing to your self, who were so friendly to the Dr. as to point it out to me.

4. You have supply'd the Dr. with a fresh authority here for that new Lesson which he gives of this fragment, and justified his correction of the learned Scholiast upon Aristophanes. The fragment itself is this.

Ἄλλ' ἐνὶ δὴ φλοιῷσι κεκοιμένα τέσσα ῥοιῶσι
Γράμματα, Κυδίππη ὅσσ' ἐρέουσι καλὴν.

In the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, for *φλοιῷσι* it stands *φύλλοισι*; and as that Lesson is admitted by him for genuine; so from him in the same words is it transcribed by the learned Mercerus: and otherwise than with that Lesson I presume it is no where to be found, nor was there ever, perhaps, before the Dr. any suspicion entertained concerning it. But the Dr. than whom (tis plain by the comparison) no man reads books more intently, discovered something of incongruity in this Lesson *φύλλοισι*, and therefore ventures, by a conjectural emendation, to restore it *φλοιῷσι*. And was at some pains to justify the correction both from reason and authority; but the most proper authority in the world to his purpose he had (I know not how) omitted. In comes our most obliging Vindicator here, and supplies him with it. Nor could one, that had studied for it, have given a fuller demonstration of the Dr.'s happiness at a conjecture, than hath this very man, who is writing a book against him; having pointed out to us the very place which establishes beyond controul every thing the Dr. hath said, Aristænet. ep. 10. (m. p. 46, 49.) εἶθε ὦ δένδρα, &c. ἣ γούν τοσαῦτα κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν ἐγκεκοιμένα φέροιτε γράμματα ὅσα τὴν Κυδίππην ἰππονομάζει καλὴν, n. b. κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν, not φύλλων, words coming as near to those of the fragment according to the Dr.'s correction of it, as prose and verse would fairly admit. Sir, the Dr. is obliged to you, and (in his name) I presume to return you thanks. This discovery (the very best in your whole book, though made without your knowing any thing of it) will, I doubt not, be inserted in the next impression of Callimachus. And therefore,

5. From hence I infer a negative directly contradictory to your affirmative, viz. 'The Dr. did not take his quotation out of the Scholiast upon Aristophanes from the editor of Aristænetus.' For if the Dr. had then had Aristænetus in his view, he would not have omitted an authority so direct to his purpose. You may cavil; but the inference is undeniable.

I have drawn out my answer to this your allegation into so many

particulars, to shew you, first, How imprudently you have acted in putting one so often in mind of things which were better forgotten : though indeed let the best pen that can be found engage any farther in this cause, it will be next to impossible to escape splitting upon the same rock. And secondly, to let you see how much it turns to the Dr.'s advantage to have his writings brought under a close examination.

C. V. The greatest and best part of those numerous quotations which adorn Dr. Bentley's edition under the several *Hērakes*, p. 351, et seq. were before collected by Johnsius. [P. 61.]

W. At which least the reader should be surprized, you spend no less than three pages to shew with what judgment and accuracy that learned person hath treated of these catalogues, indices, or tables of Callimachus. [Ibid.] So that all that you prove here is, that he must be a very extraordinary man indeed, who can so exhaust his subject as that Dr. Bentley coming after him shall not find room for improvements. And if you could have said not only the greatest and best part, but all and every one of the quotations in the Dr.'s collection were before drawn together by Johnsius, yet even so it would have amounted to no more than this : that two very learned persons treating upon the same point of antiquity, neither of them had made any material omissions. If you had known how to have managed your cause, you should have spared your elaborate elogies upon Johnsius, [P. 55, 61, &c.] with which you have but made a garland for Dr. Bentley. Like the monarch, who spent the greatest part of a long reign in gathering trophies onely to place them all at last upon his neighbour's head.

But you will not part with Johnsius so. If you can have read me hitherto without a blush, prepare for one now.

V. Dr. Bentley to conceal his transferring Johnsius's correction of Antimachus for Callimachus into his own stores, [P. 64.] cites the passage (n. 390.) out of Eusebius, whereas in the edition of Tatianus, from whom Eusebius had it, the names are as they ought to be read.

W. Good reader, look over these words again; Dr. Bentley to conceal &c. [P. 19, 25, 76.] Here doth this man, who quotes scripture and councils, charge Dr. Bentley with having stole a correction from Johnsius, and with using a certain artifice to conceal the fraud. Every syllable of which is as wilfull a falshood as words can express. Turn to the Dr.'s n. 390. p. 423. Tatianus apud Eusebium, Præp. Evang. lib. 10. *Περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ὀμήρου*, &c. After the quotation given at large the Dr. hath these words. *Ex hoc loco Vossius in libello posthumo de Poetis laudat Callimachum Colephonium : sed lege apud Eusebium Ἀντίμαχος ὁ Κολοφώνιος.* Ut recte habetur apud ipsum Tatianum, sed hoc video doctissimum JOHNSIUM ante me animadvertisse. 'Tis true the Dr. transcribes the passage out of Eusebius, but he tells us how it stands in Tatianus. The reason of his transcribing it out of Eusebius, was, I presume, to take this oppor-

tunity of giving the reader notice of a false Lection crept into the copies of that author, and of a mistake from thence transferred into Vossius his posthumous piece de Poësis. No, saith the Vindicator; he did it on purpose to conceal his having stole this correction from Johnsius. Oh Confidence! Construe it, sir. Sed hoc video doctissimum JOHNSIUM ante me animadvertisse. To conceal! as plain as pen can put down words on paper, 'tis declar'd that the learned Johnsius had made that correction before him. Here are your writers against Dr. Bentley! And will you still believe them, reader? But take another instance.

V. The corrections of the Fragment, n. 233. [P. 71, 72.] were ready made to the Dr.'s hand by Salmasius, and in Is. Vossius his MS. The old translator of Pollux had given the true rendring of ἐν δὲ Πλούτῳ. Pluto Aristophanes: which Dr. Bentley calls his own.

W. Confidently! Dr. Bentley doth not call the true rendring ἐν δὲ Πλούτῳ his own. So far is the Dr. from claiming to himself the corrections ready made to his hands by others, that in express terms he disclaims them. The Dr.'s words are these: Qui quidem locus, in vulgatis codicibus mendosissimus, rectè ità emendatus est à viris eruditis. — et ità sanè Codex qui fuit Isaaci Vossii. Is this calling things his own? 'Twere charity to believe you cannot construe Latin. But the rectifying the mistakes of the Scholast, and the correcting the text of Aristophanes himself: a correction just and necessary, and which perhaps was never so much as aimed at before the Dr. and without which, neither could the poet, nor his commentator, nor J. Pollux have been understood; this the Dr. doth call his own, and his own it is, vid. loc. Fragm. n. 233. p. 597.

V. Salvagnius Boessius in his Prolegomena to his commentary upon Ovid's Ibis, [P. 85.] hath inserted the epigram out of the Anthology (which Dr. Bentley has transcribed num. 2.) with the emendation of Καλλιμάχος for Καλλιμάχου (claimed as his own by the Dr.) though he confesses that the admirable critic Eustathius reads it Καλλιμάχου.

W. Of all this I do not understand one word. The emendation of Καλλιμάχου into Καλλιμάχε, the Dr. doth (both here Fragm. n. 2. and Ep. ad fin. Malel. p. 71.) claim as his own, and his own I believe it is. In Salvagnius Boessius's Prolegomena I find not a syllable of that epigram either with an emendation or without. Who confesses, that the admirable critic Eustathius reads it Καλλιμάχος? Salvagnius, or Dr. Bentley? in neither of them do I find the least mention of Eustathius relating to this matter. My Salvagnius Boessius, is 8vo. Lugd. 1661. There may be some later edition for ought I know, in which may be the passages you speak of; but I have never seen any such edition, nor (as I have a reason, not worth the telling, to believe) hath Dr. Bentley. So that how many soever editions of Salvagnius Boessius there may be, what Dr. Bentley here calls his own is still his own.

V. In those Prolegomena also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the Αἴτω.

W. In Dacier's *Testimonia veterum* also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the *Aïria*; and in Farnaby's Martial also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the *Aïria*. Stuff!

V. In Salvagnius Boessius his commentary upon Ovid's *Ibis* are many other good observations, which Dr. Bentley hath read.

W. 'Tis more than natural stupidity; it looks like a kind of infatuation, that a man should be so constant in confuting himself. Compare, sir, these two pages of your's; page 35. with page 85.

Page 35. The epigram out of Martial (n. 2.) is in Mr. Stanley's collection.

Page 85. The epigram out of Martial (n. 2.) is in Salvagnius Boessius (in. p. 48.) And Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read.

Page 35. The quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus (n. 2.) is in Mr. Stanley's collection.

Page 85. But Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read; and in Salvagnius Boessius is that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, verbatim, p. 47.

Page 35. The quotation out of Servius upon Virgil, n. 8. [Supr.] is transcribed from Mr. Stanley, verbatim.

Page 85. Salvagnius Boessius his commentary upon Ovid's *Ibis* Dr. Bentley hath read; and in that commentary, p. 301. is that quotation out of Servius upon Virgil.

How will you look your Honourable Patron in the face, after having thus discover'd to him how carelessly you read his book, and how little you minded the caution he gave you, Not to lay your indictment in two places. [Mr. B. p. 142.]

And this is what I before promised you to take some particular notice of. [Supr.] Read what is there written upon that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, *Εὐσεβίου γὰρ*, &c. I here repeat my charge against you, sir, and in the plain unaffected stile I call you false accuser, and prepensely such. You knew these several passages to be in Salvagnius Boessius; Salvagnius Boessius you knew the Dr. to have read: how then durst you charge these particular passages upon him as proofs of his plagiarism from Mr. Stanley's MS. all of which you knew the Dr. to have met with elsewhere; and one of which you knew, you could not but know, your own eye sight assured you, that the Dr. did actually transcribe, not from Mr. Stanley, but from Salvagnius Boessius? I say, which you could not but know, that the Dr. did not take from Mr. Stanley. For that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, as it is given us in the Dr.'s collection, I am very confident is not now (whatsoever it may be e'er long) in Mr. Stanley's MS. nor, I believe in any other printed book whatever save in Salvagnius Boessius: and therefore only from him can the Dr. have transcribed it. And this you cannot have been ignorant of, since both Salvagnius Boessius, and Dr. Bentley himself have given express notice of it: *Salvagnius*, p. 47. *Sic et Clemens Alexandrinus, lib. 5. Strom.* *Εὐσεβίου γὰρ ὁ ποιητής*, &c. Sic enim Manuscriptus meus pervetustus Codex cum in omnibus Editionibus desint hæc verba καὶ ἡ Καλλιμάχου *IBIZ*; and in Dr. Bentley, p. 343. Tit. *IBIZ* ita

Codex MStus Dionysii Salvagnii: in vulgatis IBIS abest. I do therefore again and again repeat it upon you, sir, though your whole book be a proof of it, yet more especially from this particular passage, as being an irrefragable demonstration; that you are a false accuser, and that you are preposterously such. First, in telling the world, that that is in your MS. which is not in your MS. and secondly, in placing among your proofs of things transcribed from your MS. that which you knew was not transcribed from your MS. and upon both these articles I bring, in your own Salvagnii's Elessus for evidence against you. And this you have gotten by over doing your work, and laying your indictment in two places. And the man once convicted of wilfull, I cannot say perjury, because 'tis not in a Court of Record, though you have kiss'd the Bible upon it more than once; yet of wilfull prevarication is become for ever afterwards (at least, as to that cause) an incompetent witness. And how far this sentence may extend, I leave it to those who are most concerned in it to consider: desiring them withal, out of pure compassion to themselves, not to be over eager in tempting a no very unwilling man to discover all he knows. For the letting the world know, how far base men are to be credited, I take to be doing a good piece of service to the publick; which he that shall venture upon, as he must incur the displeasure of many, so he deserves the thanks of more than one. I have complied (and not many more so obedient readers can be boast of) with Mr. B.'s unreasonable request, with which he concludes his preface to his examination of Dr. Bentley. But as for you yourself, sir, I have now near upon the matter done with you. For as for your wretched common-place railery, and your blunt characterisms upon the Dr. (most of them stole from your honourable patron, but spoil'd in the telling) I scorn to take any notice of them. But there is still behind your Supplement.

WALLACE.

A Poem which obtained the Chancellor's Medal at the Cambridge Commencement, July 1815.

"Mans hæc inimica tyrannis
Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem."

ON Gambia's banks, no sweetly-breathing gale
Cheers the lone wild or fans the thirsty vale,
In weary silence rolls each livelong day,
And nature pants beneath the sultry ray:
Yet will the negro, from his deserts torn
And far away to western climates borne,

O'er the wide ocean cast a wistful eye,
 And think upon his native sands and sigh—
 Turn we to where the Northern tempest roars,
 To Lapland's drear, inhospitable shores;
 The breast of Lapland owns no genial glow,
 Pale is her aspect and her mantle snow:
 By Winter withered, shrouded by the storm
 Amid yon arctic rocks she lifts her form,
 While ocean-blasts a deadly chilness shed,
 And meteor phantoms hover round her head.—
 And would you lure the peasant from his home
 Beneath a milder, kinder heaven to roam;
 Vain were the task—His every thought and care
 Still loves to linger in his native air;
 The child of woe, by cold and want oppress'd,
 He boasts a patriot passion in his breast,
 And, happy tenant of an humble shed,
 Smiles at the storm, that howls above his head.

Spirit of generous Pride, whose high command
 Binds all affections to one spot of land;
 Thou that canst wake a breeze on Afric's shore,
 And bid the Polar blast forget to roar;
 When, rapt in History's page, the eye surveys
 Deeds of the mighty dead in ancient days,
 Is there a tongue, that honors not thy name?
 A heart, that burns not with thy kindling flame?
 Whether, in classic record, it retrace
 Th' expiring efforts of a sinking race,
 And mark the morn, morn dear to Rome and thee,
 When Brutus struck and saw his country free:—
 Or whether later times the tale disclose,
 How Grissler triumphed in a nation's woes,
 Till vengeance bade insulted worth rebel,
 And Freedom smiled upon the sword of Tell:—
 Or how, unawed amid a cheerless land,
 Brave WALLACE reared on high the patriot brand.

Wallace, undaunted foe to lawless power,
 Friend to thy Scotland in her darkest hour,
 In action daring and in danger proved,
 Famed for thy valor, for thy virtues loved;
 These were the crimes, that claimed a tyrant's hate,
 And gave thy manhood to an early fate.
 Thee, Wallace, thine thy native woodlands mourned,
 The grots and echoing caves the moan returned;

The frowning cluff, the torrent, vale and glade
 Poured a sad tribute to thy pensive shade,
 And every gale that blew from rock and sea,
 And every zephyr bore a sigh for thee.
 The shout of war, that waked a Southern host,
 Was heard no more upon the sullen coast;
 In murmurs floating on the banks of Clyde¹
 The last, sweet music of thy bugle died;
 That beacon blaze, which patriot hands had fired,
 Glimmered a parting radiance and expired;
 Hushed was each hope, the dream of gladness fled,
 And Scotland languished, when her off-spring bled.

Heard ye that war-note burst the deep repose?
 It was the knell of Caledonia's woes—
 O saw ye not the banner streaming red?
 That banner waves above a tyrant's head—
 Proud with the spoils of Cambria's fallen state,
 And reeking from the brave Lewellyn's fate,
 Edward has summoned all his warrior band
 To pour the tide of battle on the land—
 Lusatie king, when erst on Holy shore
 Thy battle-blade was drenched in Payuin gore,
 Full oft the laurel bloomed upon thy brow --
 And seek'st thou yet another garland now?
 Lord of a mighty race, a wide domain,
 Yet canst thou envy Scotland's rugged reign?
 O sheath thy sword and fling thy buckler by,
 Nor smite the mountain haunts of Liberty.
 But vain is Reason's voice and weak her sway,
 When thirst of endless empire leads the way,
 And wild Ambition beckons and invites
 To trample on mankind's insulted rights,
 To stand, with gory lance and flag unfurled,
 High o'er the ruins of a prostrate world.
 Then fair Religion seeks her inmost cell,
 Indignant Justice bids a long farewell,
 And Science breathes a last, a dying moan,
 And sorrowing Virtue pines unpitied and unknown
 Cursed be the fatal day, when Edward came
 In crested pride to urge a lawless claim;
 Cursed be the day.—Let weeping History tell
 How fought the brave and how the noble fell,

¹ Wallace was betrayed into the hands of Edward in the neighbourhood of Glasgow.

When, slowly swelling, rolled the battle tide
On Falkirk's field of death and Carron's side—
The beam of morn, that rose on eastern height,
Danced on the plume of many a gallant knight :
The ray, that lingered on the ocean-wave,
Kissed the red turf of many a soldier's grave.
Dark as the torrent's desolating flow,
And drear as winter was that time of woe :
Yet drooped not Hope : she turned her azure eyes
Where heaven-ward Caledonia's mountains rise,
And deep embosomed in the gloom of night
A star was seen to shed a lonely light ;
It burned afar with lustre pale and sweet
To mark the spot of Freedom's last retreat.
There on a rock, unmoved and undismayed,
The sable plumage waving o'er his head,
Stern Wallace stood — With high uplifted hand
He shook the gleamy terrors of his brand,
Glanced proudly on th' embattled host below,
And mocked the menace of a conquering foe—
And long had mocked,—but Heaven untimely frowned,
And plucked the fairest flower on Scottish ground.
It was no falchion raised in mortal strife
That snatched thee, Wallace, from the light of life ;
No arrow glided on the wings of death
To drink thy blood and steal away thy breath ;
Thine were no honors of a glorious grave,
The patriot's boast, the birthright of the brave ;
Far other fate thy generous zeal repaid,
Torn from thy country, by thy friend betrayed.—
Methinks I see thee led in sullen state,
High in thy fall, and, e'en in fetters, great,
And view thee dragged in all the pomp of woe,
A sport of impotence, a public show.
Still conscious virtue cheers thy latest hour,
Nor sinks thy spirit in the grasp of power ;
Still in the pangs of death thy closing eyes
Speak the proud thoughts, that in thy bosom rise ;
And the last sigh, that gave the soul release,
Breathed to thy Scotland liberty and peace.

O Wallace, if my voice can pierce the gloom
And rouse the silent slumbers of the tomb,
O'er thy cold dust the Muse shall pour her strain,
To tell thee, that thou didst not fall in vain—
Yes, honored Shade, though brief was thy career,
And not a stone records thy lowly bier ;

E'en yet, thy native woods and wilds among,
Thy wreaths are verdant and thy deeds are sung.
There haply as some minstrel tells thy tale
To many a mountain chief and listening Gael,
Their kindling bosoms catch the patriot flame,
And learn the path to Freedom and to Fame.

EDWARD SMIRKE, St. John's College.

OBSERVATIONS

On the "REMARKS on Sir W. DRUMMOND'S Dissertation on Genesis XLIX," inserted in the Classical Journal, No. XXII.

I HAVE read the Biblical Criticisms in your *Journal* as they have regularly appeared, and I have thought from the beginning, that much good may be done by a cool and dispassionate inquiry after the sense of such passages. as in translations are altogether inconsistent with the justice and mercy of God. Even those, whose province it is to explain the Sacred Scriptures, are frequently at a loss to show that the objectionable passages (which are indeed many) are in any way even compatible with the justice and mercy of man. Much valuable information has been already given; and if some of your learned correspondents, who seem to have devoted a great part of their lives to the study of the original language, were to continue their labors, much light, no doubt, would be given to those passages, which infidels always adduce in support of their opinions.

I cannot, however, approve the productions of those writers, who not only endeavour to run down others, without referring to scripture proof, but who are in the constant habit of finding fault with every thing advanced by some of your most luminous writers, however strongly supported by evidence. This puts me in mind of a certain gentleman, who, in the House of Commons, declared himself to be such an enemy to the politics of Mr. Pitt, that he was determined to oppose him, right or wrong. I therefore take the liberty to make a few remarks on an article in your last No., p. 305, signed W. A. Hailes; and leave the judgment of your readers to determine whether he is competent for the

work he has undertaken : viz. of elucidating the Scripture from the original Hebrew.

In the translation of that memorable passage, Gen. xlix. 24.—
מִיְדֵי אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב מִשָּׁם רָעָה אָכֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל—*the arms of his hands were made strong BY THE HANDS OF THE MIGHTY GOD OF JACOB, FROM THENCE IS THE SHEPHERD THE STONE OF ISRAEL*—this gentleman, with an astonishing degree of confidence, takes the liberty (like a disciple of Kennicott) of translating it thus, “*BY THE NAME of the shepherd the stone of Israel* ;” and he says, in answer to Sir Wm. Drummond, “Can Sir William object to this version of the unpointed Hebrew ? Is there any thing, then, in the passage to embarrass a person searching for truth ?”

It does not behove me to show that the general tenor of the prophecies, contained in this most important chapter, has been mistaken by translators and commentators, but I will show that this writer is decidedly wrong in his Hebrew criticism.

The word מִשָּׁם, *mishaam*, is never, in any part of the Sacred Scripture, translated by “*name* :” it is not a *noun*, as Mr. H. has supposed, but an *adverb* ; and with the preposition מִן, *mem*, it literally means *from thence*, as it is rightly rendered in the common version, and as may be seen in every part of Scripture where it occurs—Gen. ii. 10 ; 1 Sam. iv. 4 ; 1 Kings ix. 28 ; 2 Kings xxiii. 12 ; Hos. ii. 15 ; 1 Chron. xiii. 6 ; Gen. xi. 8 ; xii. 8 ; and xviii. 16, 22 ; Lev. ii. 2.

The word which means a name, in every part of Scripture, too numerous to be introduced here, is שֵׁם, *sheem* ; Gen. ii. 11, and iii. 20, &c. Now, Sir, in disquisitions so serious as these respecting the sacred Scriptures, I would recommend Mr. H. to attend strictly to his Hebrew ; he then may help to pull down the strong holds of Satan.

Hitherto I have answered Mr. H. as though this translation had been his own, as he has purported it to be, by not acknowledging מִשָּׁם *from whence* he has taken it. But what will the learned and the unlearned say, when I prove that he has taken it from a book now before the public, without acknowledging the source of his information. If, however, the reader will refer to a book entitled, “*Commentaries and Essays, by a Society for promoting the knowledge of the Scriptures,*” vol. I. p. 283, an avowed publication of the Essex-street Socinians ; he will find that Mr. H. has taken it from that publication, or from the Note on this verse in Pearson and Rollaston’s Bible, edition 1788. I shall show, however, that this translation does no more cre-

dit to the Essex-street gentlemen, as possessing a knowledge of Hebrew, than it does to Mr. H. as the copier.

Before determining the true reading, I will remark on the absurdity of thus translating the passage. We are here first told, that *the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob*; but there was no necessity to say, as Mr. H. does, that the arms of *his hands were also made strong by THE NAME of the shepherd the stone of Israel*. To be made strong by the hands, and to be made strong by the name, would be a tautology highly condemnable. "*The arms of his hands were made strong!*" to a certainty זרעי ידיו, can have no such rendering: it is

not sense. It is a very easy matter to quote from the Septuagint, Vulgate, Tremellius, Castellio, Geneva French; to talk of the Samaritan, the Syriac, the Talmuds, &c. and thus make a pompous display of something in imitation of learning and deep research, as this writer attempts to do; but these are only translations, and not authorities; and Mr. H. has been rightly told by Mr. Collit, in your last Number, p. 275, "If names are to be taken for authorities, there is no falsehood, either in physics or morality, which may not be proved to be true."

I believe it is allowed, that Sir Wm. D. as an oriental scholar, can be equalled by very few; the opportunities he had of improving these important branches of learning, when he was ambassador at the Porte, particularly his acquisition of the Arabic language, seldom fall to the lot of a literary man. Let his *Essay on the Punic Inscription* be read by any person capable of reading it; and it will sufficiently establish his character as an oriental scholar. Should such a scholar be lightly attacked by a person whose critical knowledge of Hebrew does not enable him to distinguish an *adverb* from a *noun* in that language? Had he understood the language he would not so implicitly have adopted the suggestion of those who have shown themselves as ignorant as himself. They have however a claim to originality: nor can they be charged with copying the *discoveries*, without acknowledgment.

One might reasonably conclude, from such an exhibition, that Mr. H. had it in his power to reconcile the numerous passages in the translations which stand opposed to each other; and I could wish to see him attempt something of the kind, instead of indiscriminate censure. No article ought to be admitted on these subjects, unless it contains an elucidation of some controverted part of scripture, confirmed, not by opinion, but by other parts of scripture, where the same word can have no other meaning nor application. And, in conformity with this plan, I shall endeavour to give a true and rational translation of this passage.

Surely Mr. H. has fallen into as great an error here as when he mistook the city גִּבְעָה, *Gibeah*, for 'a hill.' Thus we find what errors are committed by those who contend for the "unpointed Hebrew." It is a species of perversion of scripture, and is as pernicious in its effects, as to contend against the integrity of the Hebrew text. Remarks of this nature will be published as manifestoes by infidels. But the enmity to the Hebrew arises from this cause: Hebrew is not considered as necessary for admission to the pulpit; therefore many have not acquired a knowledge of it in their younger season of life: it is not taught in our public schools, and after that period they conclude it too late to undertake the arduous task of acquiring a grammatical and critical knowledge of this gigantic language; rendered much more so, by the frightful appearance of *thirteen vowels*, called by these writers, *points*, not to mention the *accents*.

The only proof that can be admitted of any person's having acquired a knowledge of the Hebrew is, when we find him capable of reconciling those passages in the translation, which have aided the cause of deism, and which are altogether inconsistent with common sense, agreeably to which they were originally written. I have known those who scarcely knew the alphabet of the language, and others who were not able to point out the radical from the scivile letters, attempt to determine on the merit of an article in Hebrew. Surely not only Sir W. D. but every Hebrew scholar, will object to this, and to every version of the "unpointed Hebrew." Enough perhaps has been said in two articles, in No. XVI. and No. XVII. to show, that without the vowels, not a single word can possibly be pronounced—that, as in all other languages, so in Hebrew, they determine the true meaning and application, as is obvious in the passage before us, that they were co-eval with, and that they form a part of, the language.

Mr. H. in answer to an article in No. X. p. 250. (where it is proved that the word אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim*, is a noun singular, and that it was so understood by the most learned Jewish writers, when the language was a living language, Jonathan, who expounds the passage, 1 Sam xxviii. 18. אֱלֹהִים רָאִיתִי אֲלֵים 'I have seen an angel of the Lord ascending:' and afterwards the learned Kimchi, who expounds *Elohim* by, a great man,) says: "but I take neither of them as authority, since they do not give the literal reading, but what they conceived to be the intended meaning of the text." A more futile reason was never given: I have shown that these great authorities understood *Elohim* to be a noun singular—and Mr. H. says, "he takes nei-

ther of them as authority, as they give only what they conceived to be the intended meaning of the text." Mr. H. further observes, "we have a specimen of Mr. B.'s modesty, in charging Dr. Kennicott, and De Rossi, with ignorance of the Hebrew, and with adding to and taking from the Hebrew text." After what has been advanced on this subject by your correspondent Mr. Collit, your readers will be at no loss to determine to whom the word *modesty* is applicable. I have made good the well-founded charge, and Mr. H. has convicted himself, by enabling us to determine that, in the case before us, he does not know the difference between a *noun*, and an *adverb* in Hebrew.

It certainly would have been more satisfactory if Mr. H. had endeavoured to give a rational translation of objectionable passages, which, in their present state, are marshalled against the scriptures, for the support of infidelity.

I will give him a short list of passages for his consideration, which will be easily rectified by him, as well as a thousand beside, if he be a sound Hebrew scholar.

Numb. xix. 13. '*Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead.*' Gen. xxxvii. 24. '*And the pit was empty, there was no water in it.*' v. 18. '*And when they saw him afar off, even before he came near unto them.*' 23. '*They stript Joseph out of his coat, which was on him.*' Numb. xxii. 31. '*And he fell flat on his face.*' Psal. xxxix. 3. '*Then I spake with my tongue.*' xlv. 12. '*Thou sellest thy people for nought, and dost not increase thy wealth by their price.*' Dan. vi. 8. '*Kneeled upon his knees.*' iii. 6. '*Burning fiery furnace.*' Gen. xxiv. 26. '*Bowed down his head.*' xxvii. 14. '*And fetched, and brought.*' 1 Chron. xix. 4. '*Their buttocks.*' Lev. v. 8. '*divide it asunder.*' Isa. xxxvi. 12. '*eat their own dung.*' 1 Sam. xxv. 12. '*pisseth against the wall.*' Psal. lxxiii. 27. '*that go a whoring.*' Jer. xxxi. 22. '*A woman shall compass a man.*' Respecting this last passage, the truly learned and modest Taylor says, 'I am not able to determine it.'—perhaps Mr. H. will favor us with a translation of it. Gen. xliii. 28. '*Thy servant our father is in good health, he is yet alive.*' Isa. xxviii. 13. '*But the word of the Lord was unto them, precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little, that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken.*' Chap. viii. 14, 15. '*And he shall be—for a gin, and for a snare, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem,—And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.*' Jer. iv. 10. '*Ah, Lord God, thou hast greatly deceived this people, and Jerusalem.*' ch. xx. 7. '*O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived.*'

The arms of his hands were made strong : The translators have rendered the word יָדָיו *yaadaayo*, 'by his hands,' and מִידֵּעַ *mideec*, 'by the hands :' hence arises the improper reading, viz. *the arms of his hands were made strong*. But by the accentual reading we find, that in this passage, the word should be translated by its primary meaning, which is, *power* : see Job. i. 12—Dan. xii. 7. 2 Chron. xxi. 8. And in a secondary sense it signifies the *hand*, having power. The limit of this article will not allow me to explain the construction by the accents here, that will appear in its proper place ; the present will be satisfactory, as I have referred to those places, where the word must necessarily have this reading. The two propositions then will have a sense which can be understood, agreeably to the original, and which will read thus : **THE ARMS OF HIS POWER WERE STRENGTHENED ; BY THE POWER OF THE MIGHTY ONE OF JACOB, FROM THENCE IS THE SHEPHERD THE STONE OF ISRAEL, viz. The Messiah.**

Where now is the propriety of asking the following question ? "Can Sir W. object to this version of the unpointed Hebrew ?" I dare say that Sir W., or any other person understanding Hebrew, will object to any translation, where the translator introduces a word, or a letter, which is not in the original, when there is no necessity for it. Mr. H. has no authority for putting the article *the* in the body of the word, *by the name*. This, truly, is following the plan of Kennicott, and other modellers of the Hebrew Bible, who have endeavoured to put in *letters*, *words*, and even *sentences*, to make that plain which is sufficiently evident.—His remarks respecting the word *Elohim*, as used in the narrative of the woman of Endor, have been so fully settled in the former numbers of your *Journal*, that I, as one of your readers, expect a recantation on the part of Mr. H. It will not be the first time that he has acknowledged his errors, nor will it be to his discredit. I agree with him in his judicious remark, No. XIII. p. 62. "There is an idiosyncrasy in some men for interpreting, which is almost totally wanting in others, and which want cannot be supplied by all the grammatical knowledge in the world." I could wish to see this verified in the passages to which I have referred.

It appears that Sir W. D. objects to the present translation of Exod. vi. 3. *but by my name Jehovah, was I not known to them*. And certainly, if taken according to the common acceptation of words, it is objectionable ; because it leaves us to suppose that God was not known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *by the name Jehovah*. He who is the object of these observations says,

"How should a person who searches the Bible, as he would an astrological calendar, elicit any meaning from it, respecting devotedness to God?" Sir W. D. supposes that allusions to the science of astronomy are made in the Bible. I have nothing to do with the squabbles of Mr. H. with Sir W.: but I am of opinion that the sacred scriptures cannot be deteriorated by showing that they contain allusions to the science of astronomy, on the basis of true theology? Is not this calculated to show that they are of more consequence than many have supposed them to be? Did not that eminent oriental scholar, Sir W. Jones, declare, that he verily believed they contained allusions to all the liberal sciences? What will your correspondent say, if our best anatomists should ere long allow themselves to be indebted to the Bible for information respecting the science of anatomy, which, with all their labors, they have not yet fully obtained?

Mr. H. however, in order to remove this apparent objection in the common version, has recourse to the old method of answering all objections; for he says, "in my opinion לל, *lo*, is a corruption." Had Mr. Hailes been able to read the Hebrew Bible agreeably to the grammar of the language, with its vowels and accents, he would have known that the word לל, *lo*, is as necessary to a true understanding of the passage, as any word in the verse. I will not use such gross and unchristian-like language to this gentleman on his pretensions to Hebrew criticism, as he has to Sir W. Drummond, though, in the case before us, he does not know an *adverb* from a *noun*; but he must permit me to tell him, what every reader of this article will admit, that, notwithstanding his great anxiety for the reputation of a Hebrew scholar—notwithstanding his consulting the Rabbinical writers: it does not appear that he can read many passages. This Rabbinical reader has informed us, No. XIII. p. 71. that Onkelos has rendered יהיה מלאך *malaak Jehovah*. i. e. 'angel of Jehovah,' by יקרא דיי *yikra dii*, i. e. 'glory of Jehovah;' but after having been detected by your learned correspondent O, he then tells us, No. XXII. p. 317, that "during the time that the book of Onkelos was in my possession, I made several extracts from it, but I do not find that any of them authorise me to say your correspondent O is wrong in his statement. I do not intend to say that I have not mistaken the point mentioned above." I give him credit for this candid acknowledgement, but I appeal to every reader of the *Journal*, whether any dependence can be placed in future on the Hebrew criticisms of this writer, until he has made himself more perfect in the language. But Mr. H. says, "I have been accustomed to read sober critics—Lowth, Leusden;" &c. but even

Lowth, as I have shown in your former *Journals*, has mistaken the parts of speech in Hebrew.

Mr. H. says, that "Sir W. is not quite correct in stating, Mr. H. proposes to leave out the negative ל *lo*." "I have said," he observes, "that in my opinion it is a corruption, but I made no proposal to leave it out of the passage." Surely, if it be a corruption, it amounts to a rejection of the word. But this writer, I see, when it suits his purpose, can allow אלהים *Elohim*, to be singular. No. XXII. p. 317: for he says, "whether the person who appeared is (be) called יהוה or אלהים or מלאך יהוה, one and the same being is to be understood;" viz. no two *J.hovahs*, no two *Elohim*; and when it suits him, he can contend that it is a plural noun. p. 277.

I shall say no more of his Hebrew criticism. We have seen his errors to be too gross to admit such a claim: nor shall I in future trouble him, unless he attends to the grammar of the language, in which he is evidently defective.—And when he has so qualified himself, I would also recommend him to write in a different spirit. It is nothing but affectation to talk of "devotedness to God," if he thus writes in the spirit of persecution. Civility is as cheap as abuse: *a soft word turneth away wrath, the heart of the prudent getteth knowledge, and the ear of the wise seeketh knowledge.*

Should Mr. H. attempt to convince your readers of his knowledge of Hebrew, by recovering any of the foregoing passages from their present obscurity, contradiction, and barbarism of language, I would beg of him to remember, that though it may be satisfactory to him when pressed with a difficulty, others will never subscribe to his dogma, that, "it may be, that divine wisdom has ordered difficulties to remain (in the bible) that such men (as he is pleased to call infidels) may be snared, and fall by their own inventions." No. X. p. 248. Mr. H. may rest assured that such writing "will have no tendency to prevent the cavils of infidels." He has said, "if my knowledge of Hebrew extended no farther than Mr. Bellamy's, I would not have had the temerity to trouble the editor with any of my remarks." (No. XVIII. p. 250.): that he has "been somewhat accustomed to *mathematical deduction*," (very necessary perhaps to a right understanding of Hebrew) that, "on subjects of theology, the Bible is his *elementary treatise*, in it are contained all his *axioms, postulates, and definitions*, by the aid of which he must try every question." (No. XIII. p. 82.) Now, Sir, from such a stock, he should be able to show satisfactorily how persons, "ensnared by difficulties ordained by divine wisdom, for the very purpose, can be said to fall by their own inventions?" I have not been able to find such a doc-

trine in the *elementary treatise* to which this writer has referred. Is it really there, or has he formed it himself, in proof of his "devotedness to God?"

With regard to the original, though I have spent above twenty years in acquiring a knowledge of it, I see so much yet to be acquired that I will not call myself a master of the language, or depreciate the meritorious labors of others. I have, however, acquired sufficient knowledge to distinguish an adverb from a noun in Hebrew. For any thing further, I refer to two articles which are before your readers in No. XVI. p. 374—and No. XVII. on the higher branches of the language; and leave it for the reader to determine this matter. I certainly have the highest regard for those who by their labors have been enabled to set controverted parts of Sacred Scripture in their true light, and thus wrest them from the hands of the enemies of revelation. Such labours I conceive to be of the greatest utility to the public, and certainly calculated to maintain the credit of the Classical Journal.

J. BELLAMY.

RICHARDI BENTLEII

Epistolæ Duæ

AD

TI. HEMSTERHUSIUM.

ERUDITISSIMO VIRO,

TIB. HEMSTERHUSIO

S. P. D.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS.

DUM mane occupatus eram in scribendis meis ad Horatium annotationibus, et in recensendis foliis, quæ jam tum a typographo acceperam; venerunt ad me gratissimæ tuæ literæ, per Siskium Londino huc missæ; in quibus et eruditio tua singularis elucet cum summa humanitate conjuncta, et egregius erga me amor et voluntas. Quamobrem, ne longiore mora expectationem tuam mora-

rer, deposito statim Venusino nostro, Pollucem arripui; et quæ de singulis locis mihi sub κρίσει et conjecturam veniunt, jam hoc ipse die ad te αὐτοσχευίζω. Locus primus est IX. 57. ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς στατήρ μιν ἔδνατο. &c. Nihil hoc falsius dici potest; neque vacat nunc querere, quomodo rem expediant Salmasius, Gronovius, aliique quos memoras. Certam tibi emendationem præstabo, σταθμὸς pro χρυσός, ut ex toto loco clare ipse videbis; ὁ δὲ ΣΤΑΘΜΟΣ στατήρ μιν ἔδνατο. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἱσταμένοις, τὴν μιν τῆς ῥοπῆς στατήρα ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ὅταν εἰπωσι Πεντάστατηρον, πεντάμνον διχοῦσι λέγειν, ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἰπποκράτους Πνευματικῇ. "Ὅταν γὰρ, αἶμαι, λευκὸς ἄνθρωπος, παχὺς, Ἀργίς, λάβῃ σίκελλον, εἰσὼς τρυφᾷ, Πεντάστατηρον, γίγνεται τὸ πνεῦμ' αἷω· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ στατήρ, ὡς ὅταν εἰπῇ Ἀριστοφάνης, &c. Ex ultimis verbis νόμισμα στατήρ luce ipsa clarius est, supra non actum esse de Statere Nummo, sed *Pondere*: neque locum ibi habere γρυτῦ (quod de solo nummo dicitur) sed corrigendum σταθμός. Nempe notissimum est, Nummos et pecuniarum summas nomina sua olim a Ponderibus accepisse: inde idem vocabulum et in Ponderibus et in Nummis eundem locum habuit: Postea nummorum singulorum pondere mutato et diminuto, nominibus tamen (a pondere ductis) adhuc servatis, immane quantum discrepabat, de ponderibus, an de nummis loqueretur qui vocabula illa usurparet. Hæc comperta sunt, neque exemplis est opus. Ergo opponuntur hic et Σταθμός et νόμισμα; ut paullo ante: Ἦν δὲ καὶ μν' σταθμὸν τε καὶ νομίσματος ὄνομα; et sæpe alibi tam apud Hunc, quam apud Alios. Στατήρ igitur, cum de Pondere dicitur, *valebat*, ait, μιν. *minam*; hoc est, æquiponderabat minæ: id probat, quia ἐν τοῖς ἱσταμένοις τὴν μιν τῆς ῥοπῆς στατήρα ὀνομάζουσι, hoc est, quia *mina* ponderis ipso nomine *Stater* a ponderantibus vocaretur. Quippe si idem *nomen* habeat, habeat utique eundem *valorem*, ut barbare dicam. Tum aliud profert argumentum ex Ἰπποκράτους poetæ fabula, qui voce πεντάστατηρον (de pondere) pro πεντάμνον usus est; ergo statui idem ac Mina. Sed pro Ἰπποκράτους corrige vel Ἡράτους (ut alibi Pollux, ubi hunc ipsum locum citat, vel, ut ibi Codex Vossianus, cujus lectiones variantes habeo, Σωσικρατους) vel propius ad vulgatam hic lectionem Ἐπικράτους, qui passim Athenæo, aliisque laudatur. Sequitur ipse locus ad Iambos a nobis supra redactus; sed versu secundo pro εἰδώς, lege ἰωθὺς τρυφᾷ. sententia est, Si quis ex plebe illa urbana, albus et Soli insuetus, pinguis, piger, luxuriæ deditus, vel levissimum ligonem vix quinque librarum pondere sustulit, statim *anhelus* fit et ilia ducit. *ANIM* γίγνεται, ut Horatius noster: *SUBLIMI fugies mollis anhelitu*, quod Vir magnus, Julius Scaliger, se ex toto Galeno negavit capere posse. Verba jam, opinor, satis illustravimus: rem ipsam, nempe Staterem ἐπὶ σταθμῷ valere Minam, jam confirmatum dabimus. Pollux lib. IV. 173. Σταθμῶν ὀνόματα. ΣΤΑΘΡΑ, αἷ, οἱ τῆς Κωμωδίας ποιηταὶ τὴν ΑΙΤΡΑΝ λέγουσι, τῆς

μὲν γὰρ λίτραν εἰρήκατιν οἱ Σικελοὶ κωμῶδοι. δίκελλαν δὲ πενταστάτηρον
 Σωσικράτης ἐν Παρακαταθήκῃ, τὴν πεντάλιτρον. Sic lego ex Codice
 Vossiano, et est idem locus qui supra ex Hippocrate adductus est.
 Sententia est, ΛΙΤΡΑΝ, *Libram*, Siculorum pondus, Poëtæ Comici
 Athenienses ΣΤΑΤΗΡΑ nominant; et ligonem πεντάλιτρον Sosi-
 crates dixit πενταστάτηρον. Vides hic secundum Pollucein staterem
 (de pondere dictum) valere libram, λίτραν; in altero loco valere
 minam, μᾶν. Rectissime: quippe in Ponderibus λίτρα Siculorum
 idem valebat quod μᾶν Atticorum. Hoc certissimum est; quia
 utrumque tam mina, quam libra ducebat olim pondus centum
 Drachmarum sive Denariorum: ut alia argumenta et exempla
 taceam. Tu, Vir doctissime, si Anglice scis, de λίτρα et ceteris
 nummis ponderibusque Siculorum, multa nova reperies in Disser-
 tatione nostra de Epistolis Phalaridis. Jam ad proximum, de quo
 consulis, locum accedo, qui sic habet IX. 70. Ἐν τοῖς Ἀγιστοφών-
 τος Διόμοις ἢ Οὐλάωφ, vel, ut MSS. Διόμοις ἢ Πυράλῃ. quorum
 utrumque mendosum esse satis constat; quid reponendum sit, cum
 nusquam alibi citetur hæc fabula, certo scire nefas est. Poteris,
 Πυλάωφ, *Janitore*; poteris Πυράλῃ sive Πυράλῃ, hoc est, χυτρώ-
 ποῖ, *Batillo*; poteris Πυράλῃ, *Pythaula*. Sed hoc hariolari est;
 primum tamen magis arridet. Tertius locus est IX. 93. φησὶ γοῦν
 ἐν τοῖς Ἀποφθέγμασιν ὁ Καλλισθένης ὑπὸ Εὐθύβουλου τοῦ Ἀταρνείτου τὸν
 ποιητὴν Περσῖνον ἀμελούμενον, εἰς Μιτυλήνην ἀπελθόντα, θαυμάζοντα
 γράφει, οἷοι τὰς Φωκαῖδας ἔχων Ἰλθεν ἡδῖον ἐν Μιτυλήνῃ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν
 Ἀτάρνει καταλλάττει, qui levī manu sanari potest. lege, Φωκαῖδας,
 ἃς ἔχων Ἰλθεν, ἡδῖον — ἐν Ἀτάρνει. Et sententia est, Callisthenes
 narrat Persinum, ab Eubulo spretum, Mitylenam abiisse; atque
 ibi mirabundum scripsisse, Quod libentius permutaret (sive in vic-
 tum impenderet) Phocæenses quos secum attulit nummos, Mity-
 lenæ, quam Atarneo; hoc est, se magis ex animi sententia vivere
 hic, quam illic. Recte Φωκαῖδας ex MSS. non Φωκαῖδας. Hesych.
 Φωκαῖς ὄνομα ἔθνους, καὶ τὸ κάκιστον χρυσίου. lege vero Ἀταρνεῖ; nam
 nomen urbis Ἀταρνεῖς. De Persino nihil comperi. Sequitur Cra-
 tini locus a Salmasio tentatus IX. 99. Πανδίωνίδα πόλεως βασιλέως,
 τῆς ἐριβώλακος, οἷσθ' ἦν λέγομεν, καὶ κῆνα καὶ πόλιν, ἣν παίζουσιν. Nu-
 meros hic Anapæstos video, quo certissimo filo ex tenebris his ex-
 pedire me posse videor: lego itaque et ad versus redigo: Πανδίο-
 νίδα, πόλεως βασιλεῦ, Τῆς ἐριβώλακος, οἷσθ' ἦν λέγομεν; καὶ κῆνα καὶ
 πόλιν, ἣν παίζουσιν. Quorum hæc sententia est: O Pandionide
 (orte Pandione) rex civitatis parasitis refertæ: Scis quam civitatem
 dicimus? Non utique Athenas, sed quam latrunculis ludunt, κῆνα
 καὶ πόλιν. Hoc a Cratino πέπαικται, ait Pollux. Ergo pro ἐριβώ-
 λακος (ex vulgata et MSto Salmasii qui habet ἐρικώλακος) lego ἐρι-
 κώλακος, et propter versum et parodia ab ἐριβώλακος, quod non
 urbi, sed regioni convenit. Ἐρικώλακος itaque πέπαικεν hic Cra-

tinus, ut Aristophanes, ὁλᾶς, Θέωλος τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει, et alia multa. Deinde, ut offensam vitet, jocosè se non de Athenis urbe, sed de ludo verba facere, κύνα καὶ πόλιν, quæ explicabit tibi ipse Pollux IX. 98. καὶ τὸ μὲν πλίνθιον (sic lege, non πλινθίων) καλεῖται πόλις, τὸν δὲ ψήζων ἐκάστη, κύων. Proximus locus Eupolidis est X. 10. Αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ σκεύη καλοῖτ' ἂν ἐπιπλάγιον ἢ κορυφὴ κτήσις, τὰ ἐπιπλάγις ὄντα τῶν κτημάτων. Ὁ γοῦν Εὐπολὶς ἐν τοῖς Κόλαξι προσειπὼν — ἄκουε δὴ σκεῖν τὰ κατ' οἰκίαν, ἐπήγαγε παραπλήσιον τεσσυγγέγραπται τοῖς τὰ ἐπιπλα. Pro istis ἐπιπλάγιον ἢ, tu, Vir doctissime, refingis, ἐπιπλα ἤγουν ἢ κορυφὴ κτήσις. satis commode, quoad sensum. Sed vestigia literarum vide, et sic potius scribes, ἐπιπλα, οὐκ οὐ κορυφὴ κτήσις. Hoc certissimum : deinde tentas ; Τέως οὖν γέγραπται σοι τὰ ἐπιπλα Prope hoc ad literas, sed nullum inest metrum. Lego et distinguo, ut senarius sit Iambicus, Παρεπλήσιον τε σοι γέγραπται τὰ ἐπιπλα. Sententia est, Cum Eupolis prius dixisset, ἄκουε τὴ σκεῖν τὰ κατ' οἰκίαν, mox subjunxit (ἐπήγαγε) addidit, *Et similiter descripsis*, numerata, tibi sunt τὰ ἐπιπλάγια, *vasa mobilia*. Τὰ ἐπιπλα pro τὰ ἐπιπλα primam syllabam producit, ut τὰμα. τὰδικα, &c. Venio ad locum X. 18. ubi verba Alexidis, Πρὶ δέ μ' ἄγεις ; διὰ τῶν κύκλων. et sic MS. Vossianus. mox Diphili ῥήσις ex Excerptis tuis, Καὶ προσέτι τοῖνον ἐσχάραν καὶ ἰὼν κάδον, στρώματα, συνὸν ἀσκήρηα, θύλακον, ὡς ποῦ στρατιώτην ἂν τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλον ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ὁρῶν βαδίζειν ὑπολάβει τοσοῦτος ἐστ' ὁ ῥῶπος, ὅγον σὺ περιφέρεις. Quos Iambos esse recte calluisti, et sic emendas, καὶ ἰὼν — συνόντα τ' ἀσκήρηα, — στρατιώτης — ὑπολάβεις, περιφέρεις. Recte hoc postremum : totum vero locum, vide, an sic potius rescripseris : Καὶ προσέτε τοῖνον ἐσχάραν, κενὸν κάδον, Στρώματα. σίγνον, ἀσκήρηαν, θύλακον. Ὡς ποῦ στρατιώτην ἂν τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλον Ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ὁρῶν βαδίζειν ὑπολάβει τοσοῦτος ἐστ' ὁ ῥῶπος, ὃν σὺ περιφέρεις. Servulum, credo, aliquem alloquitur quis, variis utensilibus humeros oneratum. Tot res, inquit, cervice gestas, ut Militem te esse existimet quivis (Scis milites olim omnia arma et utensilia sua suis humeris in agmine portasse) vel potius κύκλον et totam turbam ῥωποπωλῶν ex foro domum redire : Tanta vasorum vis est, quam tu portas. Κενὸν κάδον, πρὶ, si vino plenum esset, impar esset servulus tot rebus gestandis. αἱ autem et ε passum inter se mutari, nullus dubito, quin probe scias. Σίγνον, quod et metro et sententiæ aptum ; *hastam ferream* ; inde sequitur, quod στρατιώτην esse suspicetur quis. ὃν σὺ pro ὅσον σὺ clara correctio est. Κύκλος vel κύκλος erat locus in Foro, ubi σκεῖν utensilia venibant : *Credat itaque* aliquis ipsum κύκλον cum omnibus suis vasis ex foro ambulare : adeo onustus es omni genere vasorum. Atque hactenus, ut expedite, ita, ni fallor, feliciter res processit. Quæ vero postea quæris, sunt ejusmodi, ut nullus sit conjecturæ locus : adeo curta, mutila et mendosa sunt. X. 76. *scapham*, inquit, Aristophanes vocat, in quam invomunt, ut

καὶ ἡμισκαζῆς δ' ἐν στίχῳ ποδολογίων ἐμοῦμεν. quod sic ipse tentas. Καὶ ἡμί. σκαζή 'σθ' ὡς ἂν ἐν τῇ ποτὸν εἶνον ἐμοῦμεν. Nihil video, nisi Te-trametri versus vestigia,

Καὶ μιν οὐ καζή 'σθ' υ - υ - - υ - ἐμοῦμεν, quale illud,

Ἀνδρες εἰλίαι, καὶ δηλόται, καὶ τοῦ πονεῖν ἐραῖται!

Nolim autem, ut conjecturæ tuxæ fidas; neque enim metrum ullum, nec Græcam orationem servat. Cetera piget describere: neque enim nunc otium est; si vellem nervos intendere, et extundere aliquid. Tu igitur hæc, qualiacumque sunt, æqui bonique consule, et raptim bene vale.

ON THE MARGITES OF HOMER.

THE passages, in which positive mention is made of the Margites as Homer's, are to be met with in Aristot. De Poet. 7. 8. Eudem. v. 7. De Mor. vi. 7. Plat. Alcib. ii. p. 94. [edit. Bipont.] Clem. Alexand. Strom. i. Dio. Chrys. Orat. lxi. p. 554. Joan. Tzet. Hist. Chil. iv. 868. vi. 599. Mar. Victorin. p. 2521. 2572. and Atul. Fortunat. p. 2642. In the rest, as Hephæst. p. 112. 120. [edit. Casf.] Harpocrat. in *Μαργίτης*,¹ Eustath. on Odys. k. p. 413. and the Scholast. on Aristoph. Av. 914. the authenticity of the work is uniformly questioned: as by these it is referred to, either under the title of ὁ *Μαργίτης* οὐκ εἰς "Ὅμηρον ἀναφερόμενος, or in some way otherwise ambiguous. Suidas goes further, and affirms that it was not written by Homer at all; but by one Pigres, who inserted an elegiac verse between every pair of lines, taken in order, throughout the whole Iliad. "Ὅς τῇ Ἰλιάδι παρενέβαλε κατὰ στίχον ἐλεγείον, οὕτω γραψας: Μῆνιν ἄει' ε, Θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος, Μοῦσα, σὺ γὰρ πάσης πεῖρας ἔχεις σοφίης. Ἐγραψε καὶ τὸν εἰς "Ὅμηρον ἀναφερόμενον *Μαργίτην*, καὶ Βατραχομινομαχίαν. See under Πίγρης.

The fragments of this poem, that remain, are but three in number; and are all of them written in the heroic measure. They have been collected by Twining, (*Translation of Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry*, p. 193) and are these:

Μουσίων θεράπων καὶ ἐκρηβόλου Ἀπόλλωος.

(Schol. Aristoph. Av.)

Τόνδ' [τὸν δ'] οὐτ' αὖ [ἄρ' edd.]² σκαπτῆρα θεοὶ θέσαν, οὐτ' ἄροτῆρα,

¹ With respect to the orthography of the word, I would write *Μαργίτης* not *Μαργεῖτης*; as we read *Θερσίτης*, not *Θεσεῖτης*. Not more than two or three passages, where the word occurs, have the form *εῖτης* at all; and, wherever that form is given, one, or more, of the various readings gives *ίτης*.

² Perhaps we ought to read *οὔτε* in the place of *οὐτ' ἄρ'* or *οὐτ' αὖ*.

Οὐτ' ἄλλως τι σοφόν' πάσης δ' ἡμάρτανε τέχνης.

(Aristot. Eudem. De Mor. & Clem. Alex.)

Πόλλ' ἡπίστατο ἔργα, κακῶς δ' ἡπίστατο πάντα.

Plat. Alcib. ii.

We are informed, however, by Hephæstion, that the *Margites* was not wholly written in heroics, but that these were occasionally interspersed with iambic lines, although upon no settled principle. Μετρικὰ δὲ ἄτακτα, ὅσα ἐκ μέτρων μὲν ὁμολογουμένων συνέστηκε, τάξιν δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώκῃσιν οὐκ ἔχει, οὔτε κατὰ στίχον, οὔτε κατὰ συστήματα, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ Μαργίτης, ὁ εἰς "Ὁμηρον ἀναφερόμενος, ἐν ᾧ παρέσπартαι τοῖς ἔπεισιν ἱαμβικά, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ οὐ κατ' ἴσον σύστημα. p. 112. And again, speaking of the same μετρικὰ ἄτακτα, he says; τοιοῦτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ Μαργίτης "Ὁμήρου" οὐ γὰρ τεταγμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἔπων τὸ ἱαμβικὸν ἐπιφέρεται. p. 120. So also¹ Joānnes Tzetzes, Hist. Chil. iv. 867. "Ἀκούε τὸν Μαργίτην, Εἰς ὃν ὁ γέρων² "Ὁμηρος ἡρωϊαμβοῖς γράφει. The verses, thus made up of heroics and iambs, were called, in general terms, ἡρωϊαμβοί; as ἡρωελεγείον was the name for that species of versification, which was formed by a union of the elegiac with the heroic. Marius Victorinus: "Hexametro Dactylico trimeter Iambus comparatur, q em Latinè senarium nominamus, veluti Hexametrum; sex enim pedes Iambos habet, ut ille Dactylos, cum uterque purus ex se figuratur. Trimetrus autem appellatur a Græcis, quia tribus percussionibus per dipodias caditur. Ideoque dicitur et Homerus in Margite suo miscuisse hos versus tanquam pares." p. 2524. Again: "Hoc genere versuum, ut supra diximus, primus usus est Homerus in Margite suo, nec tamen totum carmen ita digestum perfecit, nam duobus pluribusque hexametris antepositis istum subjiciens copulavit, quod postea Archilochus interpolando composuit." p. 2572. Compare also Atilius Fortunatianus, p. 2692. "Sequitur ut de Iambico dicere debeamus, cujus auctorem alii Archilochum, alii Hipponactem volunt. Sed primus Homerus hoc usus est in Margite." See Gaisford's Hephæstion, p. 360.

If we are to give credit to the last mentioned authorities, Archilochus was not the inventor of the iambic measure. But this assertion appears to me to be founded in nothing more than the circumstance of their considering the *Margites*, in the state in which they had it, as genuine; ³ which it certainly cannot have been.

It is to be observed, that, in consequence of the doubt, which seems to have existed upon the minds of several of the Grammarians, and of

¹ Correct, by the way, the next line but one in Tzetzes, by referring to his Hist. Chil. 597. The line, as it stands, is ἐξανεῶ τις αὐτὸν ἐγκυμονήσας βρέφος; where the first word is by some interpreters rendered *ex Inero*, and by others *enirata*, without any meaning in either case. Read ἐξανεῶτα τις.

² Dio Chrysostom, on the other hand, speaking of the *Margites*, says; δοκεῖ τοῦτο ποίημα ὑπὸ "Ὁμήρου γεγενῆσθαι νεωτέρου, καὶ ἀποτειρωμένου τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως. Orat. liii. p. 554.

³ "Iambicum usurpabatur metrum ab Archilochō primūm, si constanti scriptorum omnium testimonio fidendum est." *Tyrwhitt's Aristotle*, p. 122.

Eustathius in particular, relatively to the authenticity of the *Margites*, scholars have been divided in their opinion on this head. Some have affirmed that the *Margites* was not written by Homer at all; while others contend that the poem spoken of by the Grammarians is a different composition altogether from that referred to by Plato and Aristotle, which alone they consider as genuine. Neither of these opinions seems to me satisfactory. For, since Plato and Aristotle both quote from the piece as authentic, we may fairly infer from thence that such was the general opinion amongst the Greeks; whose sources of information were certainly more plentiful than ours. Add to this the very great repute in which the poem seems to have been held by them, (and they were not a people likely to set a high value upon a composition of nothing more than ordinary merit,) and it seems almost preposterous to conclude otherwise than that Homer did write the *Margites*, although not in the form, in which it was afterwards handed about. It was written therefore by Homer, and that too in heroics: and as for the iambic lines, which the Grammarians allude to as having a place in the work, I conceive them to have been interpolated afterwards; and, in all likelihood, by the same Pigres, who foisted his pentameter verses into the *Iliad*.

As we are told by Suidas that in the *Iliad* the elegiacs of Pigres were interpolated *κατὰ στίχον*, i. e. line for line, it is highly probable that the same was the case at first with the *Margites*; and that, as the poem (like all others at that day) would be preserved entirely by oral tradition, a great part of the interpolated iambs, being for the most part the mere substance of the several preceding lines, or something of the same stamp, expressed in another metre, would in this way gradually slip out of the memory. And this the more, as the² chain of the poem would not be interrupted; while the ear, being accustomed to the free and regular flow of the heroic movement, would naturally drop the intervening iambs, as discomposing the harmony of the. This may account for the confusion which Hephaestion speaks of relatively to the arrangement of the two metres. *Τάξιν δὲ καὶ ἀνακύκλῃσιν οὐκ ἔχει, οὔτε κατὰ στίχον, οὔτε κατὰ συστήματα*. This conjecture derives additional support from the second of the two passages adduced from Victorinus; from whence it appears clearly enough that in the *Margites*, as he had it, there was frequently a succession of two or more heroics, but never more than one iambus at once. Compare also the Scholiast on Hephaestion, p. 120. *ἀτάκτως, ὅποι ποτὶ τὸ ἀτακτὸν ἐποίησε με-*

¹ *Ἐπεπίστευτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Μαργίτης τοῦ Ὁμήρου εἶναι.* Schol. Aristoph. Av. 914.

² For example, suppose one of the fragments above-quoted to have run thus, with the interpolation:

Τὸν δ' οὔτε σκαπτῆρα θεοὶ θέσαν, οὔτ' ἀροτῆρα,

Οὐ σιτοποιὸν, οὔτε μηχανοῖράφον,

Οὔτ' ἄλλως τι σοφόν κ. τ. λ.

The absence of the iambus leaves no breach in the sense, nor does its presence obstruct it.

τρικόν. οὐ γὰρ τεταγμένῳ ἀριθμῷ μετὰ γὰρ δέκα στίχους ἐπιφέρει ἱαμβον καὶ πάλιν μετὰ πέντε καὶ ὀκτώ.

Yet, although I am of opinion that the Margites, referred to by Aristotle, Hephaestion, &c. is radically the same piece, it is at the same time highly probable that the hero of this poem may have been¹ the subject of many others, of inferior note; and that, in process of time, some passages from them may have crept into the genuine performance. It should seem, however, that these, for the most part, have mistaken the character; and made an idiot of him, whom Homer meant to represent only as wrong headed, whimsical, and eccentric. But the turn of Margites's mind seems rather to have been analogous to that of Hudibras or Don Quixote. Out of these petty compositions would naturally proceed those idle stories and puerile jokes, which have been pawed upon the person of Margites; and which² Twining is, with reason, at a loss how to reconcile with what it is presumed the character of Homer's Margites was. Thus Suidas, in v. ὡς φασιν ἀριθμῆσαι μὲν μὴ πλείω τῶν ἐδουληθῆναι ἐργῶν δὲ ἀγρίων μὴ ἄλλασθαι αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ φοβείσθαι λέγοντα, μὴ τῇ μοιρῇ αὐτὸν διαβάλλῃ· οἱ τοιοῦτοι δὲ κραδίαν ἔδην γεγεννημένον, καὶ πενθήναιον τῆς μητρὸς, εἶχε ἀπο τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς ἐπέχθη. See also Hesychius in v. In Eustath. Odyss. K. p. 413. a story is told of him so truly ridiculous, and at the same time so indelicate, that we think the good Archbishop might, without much harm, have suppressed it entirely. Compare also Tzetzes, Hist. Chil. 596. Οὗτος κραιφνομώτατος [αὐτὸν παραφρονομώτατος] ὦν γέρων ὁ Μαργίτης Ἐξανηρώτα, τίς αὐτὸν ἐγκυμονήσας βρέφος ἔκ τῆς γαστρὸς ἐγέννησεν; ἃρ' ὁ πατήρ, ἢ μήτηρ;

Hence the word Μαργίτης latterly became synonymous with *fool*, *idiot*, &c. Thus Hesychius; Μαργίτου· ἄφρονος, μωροῦ. Suidas; Μαργίτης. Αἰσχίνης, ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος, ἐ-ωνυμίαν Ἀλεξάνδρου Μαργίτην ἔθετο. Ἐκαλοῦν δὲ τοὺς ἀιόητους οὕτω Harpocritas, in v. Μαργίτης· Αἰσχίνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος. Ἐπωνυμίαν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου Μαργίτην ἔθετο. Καὶ Μαρσάσις ἐν πέμπτῳ τῶν περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἱστορεῖ, λέγων Μαργίτην ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους καλεῖσθαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον. Ἐκαλοῦν δὲ τοὺς ἀιόητους οὕτω, διὰ τὸν εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀναφερόμενον Μαργίτην. Libani, in περσικῇ ad Julianum; Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ πολλὰ παρὰ τῶν ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ρητόρων ηδωκυμένον, ταῦτε πραγματά παραποιῶν, καὶ τοὺς δήμους κινούντων, καὶ Μαργίτην αὐτὸν ἀποκαλούσων, καὶ ὕβριζόντων κ. τ. λ. See also Plutarch in Demosth. & Erasm. Chil. ex. Lucian.

And now that I have spoken of Margites in the capacity in which he seems afterwards to have been represented, I shall be at the pains to enumerate some others of the same class; amongst whom we find

¹ Thus Suidas; Μαργίτης· ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ μωρίᾳ κραιφνοδούμενος.

² "It is not easy to reconcile it with some other accounts, which seem to make Margites a downright idiot; such as, his not being able to number beyond five, his abjuring from all intercourse with his bride, lest she should complain of him to her mother, &c.—One cannot well conceive, how such a man should, as Homer expressly says, 'Know how to do many things;' even though he did them ever so ill."—*Translation of Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry*, p. 194.

one named Melitides. This celebrated idiot seems to have been confounded with Margites himself; for Eustathius tells the very same story of him, that Suidas and Tzetzes do of our hero. See his commentary on *Odys.* K. p. 413. *Aristoph.* *Ran.* 1022. edit. Kust. *Erasm.* *Adag.* p. 1023. and Tzetz. p. 74. Another of these, of well known fame, was Sannas,¹ the son of Theodotus. Cratinus in the play, speaking of him, says; 'Ο δ' ἡλίθιος, ὡς περ πρόβατον βῆ βῆ λέγων, Βαδιζει.² A third was known by the appellation of Mammacuthus. Suidas in v. *Aristoph.* *Ran.* 1021. Tzetz. p. 75. Eustath. *Odys.* K. p. 415. Hesych. in v. In which passages it is to be remarked that the word is spelt in four different ways, viz. *Μαμμάκουθος*, *Μαμμάκυνθος*, *Μαμάκουθος*, & *Μαμακύνθος*. See the Scholias on the passage referred to in the *Ran.* But I will quote at full length what Eustathius says on the subject. Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι ἐδηλώθη ἐπὶ Θερσίτου, καὶ ἀφελεῖ τινα προσωπί καὶ οὐ πᾶν σπονδαῖα κίς Ἰστροῖν ἐστρατεύσατο. Οἷος δὲ τις καὶ ὁ Ἰλπήνωρ ἐνταῦθα· [*Odys.* K. 552.] ὃν Ὀμηρος οὐκ ἐθέλων σφοδρῶς κακολογεῖν, προαγεῖ τὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ἀποφαικῶς· εἰπὼν οὔτε ἀνδρείον πᾶν οὔτε φρενέηρ αὐτὸν εἶναι. Πολυμῆθεις δὲ χάριν οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ τοιαῦτα παρηγέρονσιν οἷς γράφουσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοιούτων εὐπορία τις γένοιτο τοῖς ἱστορίῃν ἐθέλουσιν. Ἐκείθεν τὸν μωρὸν οἰδαμεν Σάνναν καλεῖσθαι, ὡς ἀπὸ τίνος κυρίον ὀνόματος· καὶ παράγεται Κρατίνος, κομψῶν τοιούτων, τὸν Θεοδοτίδην Σαιναι. Ἐξ ἐκείνων δὲ καὶ Κοροῖβος τινὲς ἀποσκωπτομεν, μαθητὸς τινὰ Κοροῖβον εὐήθη, Μυγδύνα Φρύγα τὸ χειρὸς, ἐστατον τῶν ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἀφικόμενον· τῷ Ἡριάμῳ δὲ εὐήθειαν. Οὕτως ἐγίνομαι καὶ τὸν ἄφρονα Μαργίτην, τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ μαργαίνειν, ὃ ἐστὶ μωραίνειν· ἐν ὃ ποιήσας τὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον Ὀμήρου Μαργίτην ὑποτίθεται εὐποριῶν μὲν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν γονέων φοναί, γήμαντα δὲ κ. τ. λ.—Ὅμοιος καὶ τὸν Μαρμακύνθον, καὶ τὸν Μελιτίδην, καὶ τὸν Ἀμφιτίδην, οἱ διαβόητοι ἐπὶ μωρίᾳ ἦσαν. Ὡν ὁ Μελιτίδης ἀράθμεν τε μὴ ἐπιστάσθαι λέγεται εἰ μὴ ἄχρι τῶν πέρι, καὶ ἀγνοεῖν πρὸς ὑποτίρησιν τῶν γονέων ἀποκαρθεῖν, καὶ νύμφη [νύμφης] μὴ ἄψασθαι, ἐλλαθούμενος τὴν πρὸς μητέρα διαβολήν. Ὡς περ δὲ τοῦτους ἡ ἱστορία λόγου ἤξισεν, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸν τὰ κύματα μετροῦντα Πολύωρον, καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ καθ' ὕδιν θέμενον ὕδριαν κενὴν ὑγροῦ πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ θλιζόμενον [αὐτὸν θλιζόμενον] τῇ σκλήροτητι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἄχρην παρὰβύσαντα, καὶ τὸ σκεῖος πλήσαντα, ἵνα [ἵνα] οἱ δῖοι μολακὸν εἴη προσκεφάλαιον, οὕτω κ. τ. λ. To this list may be added two female idiots, named respectively Acco and Alphito; although Plutarch tells us that they were considered in the light of bugbears to frighten children into their duty. From the first of these came

¹ *Erasm.* *Adag.* p. 1711. *Eustath.* *Odys.* E. p. 545. οὕτω καὶ ὁ παρὰ τὸν κομικῶν Κρατίνῳ Σάννας· αὐτὸς μέντοι οὐ τὸν εὐήθη ἀπλῶς δηλοῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸν μωρὸν· ὃν ἴσως ἡ κοινὴ γλῶσσα Ἰζάννον λαλεῖ. Δοξοὶ ὁ ἀν' εἰληφθαί η' λέξεις ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσιανῶν Σάννων, οὗς οἱ διδῶται Ἰζάννους καλοῦσι, βαρβαρικὸς ὄντας, καὶ, ὡς εἰκός, εὐήθεις δι' ἀπαιδεύσαν. Hence the Latin words *sanna* and *sannio*, *Pers.* *Sat.* i. 62. *Cic.* *de Orat.* ii. 61. *Epist.* *Fam.* ix. 16. But *Cassaubon* (*Comm.* on *Pers.* p. 106.) derives *sanna* from *ἰσῶ*, *accuere*, from whence come *ἰσῶ*, *dens*, and *כִּיכֶשׁ*, *aculeatus ornat.* Hence also the English word, *zany*. *Preacher* at once and *zany* of thy age. *POPE*.

² Perhaps *Ἐβαδιζειν* is the true reading.

the words ἀκκιζειν, *accissare*, *nugari*, and ἀκκισμός, *accissimus*, *nugatia*. Cic. Attic. ii. 19. *Quid enim ἀκκιζόμεθα tam diu?* Philem. apud Athen. xiii. οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲ εἰς Ἀκκισμός, οὐδὲ λήρος. Eustath. Iliad. Z. p. 494. Καὶ ἡ Ἀκκὴ τὸ παροιμιώδες κύριον καὶ τὸ κωμικῶς εἰπεῖν μακκοῦν, ἴσον [ἴσον] ὃν τῷ μὴ νοεῖν. Again, Odys. Φ. 49. Κοεῖν δὲ τὸ νοεῖν δοεῖν καὶ μακκοῦν, τὸ μὴ νοεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀνοηταίνειν. Tzetzes p. 75. calls her Macco. Μωρία γυνή τις ἡ Μακκῶ, ἡ κάτοπτρον κρατοῦσα, Καὶ τὴν σκιὰν τὴν ἑαυτῆς ὁρῶσα τῇ κατόπτρῳ, Ἄλλην δοκοῦσα γυναικῶν, φιλίως εἰροσηγῶμαι. See Erasm. Adag. p. 1669. Tzetzes also informs us that idiots were called Blitomammantes, from one Blitomammas no doubt. Ἀπαντες Βλιτομάμμαντας πρὶν τοὺς μωροὺς ἐκάλουν. p. 74. Add also Bufalo to the number. Βουταλίων, καὶ Κόροιβος, καὶ Μελιτιάδης, ἐπὶ μωρία διεβίβλητο. Suidas in Βουταλίων.

That the author of the Iliad and Odyssey should have employed himself upon a composition so different in grain and cast from either of them, may at first sight seem strange. Experience, however, has shown us that a genius for the satirical and ridiculous is by no means incompatible with a talent for the sublime and pathetic. Thus, we see, Milton could write those Epitaphs on Hobson, the Cambridge carrier, and that Sonnet entitled, *On the detraction which followed upon my writing certain treatises*;—which, in my opinion, have very considerable merit, and are many degrees removed above those spiritless performances, with which our presses teem nowadays in profusion, and which affect to leave a sting without having a sting to leave. The same may be said of Gray's *Long story*, which contains much genuine wit and humour, and shows great skill in that particular method of versification, without which such pieces lose half their virtue and enamel. And so of Euripides, the author (as it is generally believed) of the *Cyclops*, the only specimen that remains of the Greek Satyrical Drama; who in his *Alcexis* also has furnished us with something like a sample of what he could do in this way. Thus also we see that *Macbeth* and the *Merry Wives of Windsor* were written by the same person.

But even in the Iliad and Odyssey, to say nothing of the account of Thersites in the former, and of the blinding of the Cyclops, the pun upon the name of Ulysses, &c. in the latter, there are passages less obvious here and there interspersed, which have in them a great deal of the comic. The well known line Οἶνοβαρέε, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων, κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο. (Iliad. A. 225.) savours something of this. The railing speech of Patroclus, on the occasion of his killing Cebriones, Hector's charioteer, has a strong tendency to the ridiculous; and is, perhaps, beneath the dignity of the poem. Homer says that he fell from the chariot ἀρνευτήρι ἐοικώς, viz. head-foremost; which comparison is natural enough; as, being wounded in the forehead, and that in the position in which he would be (*pronus in verbera pendens*, Æn. v. 147.), he would necessarily fall in that direction. However, by putting the following words into the mouth of Patroclus, which were suggested by the idea of the charioteer tumbling headlong—*diver-wise* (as a translator of the Iliad would have said not many centuries ago), he

gives, as appears to me, a ludicrous turn to the whole. Ὡς ποιοί, ἢ μάλ' ἐλαφρὺς ἀνὴρ ὡς ρεία κυβιστῆ. Εἰ δὴ πον καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι γένοιτο, Πολλοὺς ἂν κορέσειεν ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθεα διφῶν, Νηὸς ἀποθρῶσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἴη. Ὡς νῦν ἐν πεδίῳ ἐξ ἰππων ρεῖν κυβιστῆ. Ἡ ῥα καὶ ἐν Τρώεσσι κυβιστῆ-ἦρες εἰσιν. The passage is in Iliad. Π. 745. In Odys. A. 215. Telemachus says μάλ' ἀτρεκέως sure enough, as he professed to say, but somewhat laughably; Μήτηρ μὲν τ' ἐμέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι· αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε Οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γάρ πω τις ἰὼν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω. This, it seems, did not escape the comic poet Menander, who says; Αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο. Ἄλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν. See Eustathius on the passage in the Odyssey, from whom Bentley replaced the true reading ποτ' ἐγένετο in lieu of the clumsy and awkward interpolation of Le Clerc. The sarcastic reflection of Eurymachus upon the bald head of Ulysses (Odys. Σ. 352.) is singular in the same way. Οὐκ ἄθεοι δ' ἀνὴρ Ὀδυσῆος ἐς δόμον ἵκει· Ἐμψης μοι δοκεῖ δαΐδων σέλας ἔμμεναι αὐτοῦ Καὶ κεφαλῆς· ἐπεὶ οὐ οἱ ἐνὶ τρίχες οὐδ' ἠβραιαί. Whoever has seen a painting on canvas of Old Parr's head, will readily comprehend the joke. The story of Elpenor's death (Odys. K. 552.) may, perhaps, be placed to the same account. Ἐλπήνωρ δέ τις ἔσκε νεώτατος, οὐδέ τι λίην Ἀλκιμος ἐν πολέμῳ, οὔτε φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀνηρώς, (Ὁ μοι ἀνευθ' ἐτάρων, ἱεροῖς ἐν δώμοισι Κίρκης, Ψύχεος ἱμεῖρων κατελέξατο οἶνον ῥαρείων· Κινυμένων δ' ἐτάρων ὅμαδον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκούσας, Ἐξαπίνης ἀνόρουσε, καὶ ἐκλάβετο φρεσὶν ἦσιν Ἀψορρόν καταβῆναι ἰὼν ἐς κλίμακα μακρὴν· Ἀλλὰ καταντικρὺ τέγεος πέσεν· ἐκ δέ οἱ αὐχὴν Ἀστραγάλων ἐάγη, ψυχὴ δ' αἰδύσδε κατῆλθεν. See also A. 51. seqq. The slur upon Nireus too (Iliad. B. 671.) is of this sort. He is there mentioned as being the handsomest man in the Grecian army except Achilles; 2 and his name occurs thrice within the space of three lines, but is not to be found again throughout the whole of the Iliad. These instances I have collected and strung together, as they suggested themselves to my recollection. The number will, I make no doubt, admit of considerable increase.

August, 1815.

V. L.

DR. CROMBIE'S REMARKS

On the Notice of his GYMNASIUM, *sive* SYMBOLA
CRITICA;

No. II.—[Continued from No. XXII. p. 304.]

AUDAX.—I perfectly concur with the intelligent critic in the meaning, which he assigns to *audax*; nor can I account for the mistake,

¹ Ἡβαιὸν μικρόν. Hesychius in v. Compare Iliad, = 141.

² Ἐνταῦθα τρεῖς ὀνομάσας τὸν Νιρέα οὐκ ἐτι αὐτοῦ ἐμνήσθη. So says the Scholiast. See also Galen. Pergam. Suasor. ad Artes, Orat. 8.

unless by supposing, that I inconsiderately adopted the explanation of Doletus, who is guided by the usage of Cicero only ; or of Popina, who says "*Audax in vitio est ; fortis in laude.*" This explanation, however, though generally, is not universally, correct. The term, though most frequently employed in a bad sense, and even when this is not the case, generally implying a degree of hardness, and boldness of enterprise, superior to the conceived powers of the agent, yet is sometimes used in a good sense, denoting a becoming degree of fortitude and courage. My expression therefore ought to have been qualified ; and the same explanation of the secondary idea should have been assigned to *audax*, as I have given to *audacia* ; with this only difference, that the latter is more frequently used in a good sense, than the former. By Cicero the substantive is almost uniformly employed in a bad sense : *Audacia temeritati, non prudentiæ conjuncta.* (Orat. Part.) *Audacia fortitudinem imitatur.* (Ib.) *Animus paratus ad periculum si sua cupiditate, non utilitate communi impellitur, audaciæ potius nomen habet, quam fortitudinis.* (Cic. Off.) This elegant writer, however, occasionally, though rarely, employs the term *audacia* in a good sense. *Audax*, as far as I can ascertain, is always employed by him in a reprehensive sense, conveying the idea of error and excess. If the learned critic can name any passage, in which he has used the word in a different acceptation, I will esteem it a favor if he will point it out. In the mean time his observation, as it deserves, receives my thanks.

ALTA VOX.—In delivering my opinion of the expression *alta vox*, I have cited in its favor the authority of Catullus ; I ought, however, at the same time to have remarked, that some critics in the passage, which I have quoted, read *vox* instead of *vox*. I have likewise cited the phrase *vocem attollere altius*, which has been offered, as presumptive evidence, that *alta vox* is a classical expression. The evidence I conceive not to be quite conclusive ; without, however, condemning it as a barbarism, I merely observe that analogy is not always a safe guide to purity of diction. And it is somewhat remarkable, that neither Cicero nor Sallust, Livy nor Cæsar, ever employ this expression, but uniformly *magna vox*. *Cum legem Voconium magna voce, et bonis lateribus suavissem.* (Cic. de Senect.) *Magna voce hortatur.* (Sallust B. J. cap. 60.) When Cicero also enumerates the various principal characters of voice, he uses *magna* not *alta vox*. *Nam voces, ut chordæ sunt intentæ, quæ ad quemque tactum respondeant, acuta, gravis ; cita, tarda ; magna, parva.*

I would, therefore, recommend to the classic writer to employ *magna* in preference to *alta vox*.

The following observation of Gesner, the critic remarks, deserves attention : "*Vox alta a musicorum diagrammatis primum*

dicta." The correctness of this opinion has been questioned; and it has been asserted that the very reverse was the fact, the highest notes being marked by characters placed at the bottom of the scale, or musical line, and the lowest notes by characters placed at the top. Whether this was, or was not the practice, there is reason to suppose that the deepest or gravest sound was called *summa* by the Romans, and the shrillest or acutest *ima*. Gesner himself, in his note on the passage in Horace, *modo summa voce, modo hac resonat quæ chordis quatuor ima*, as far as I recollect, (for I have not his edition at hand) considers *summa* as equivalent to *gravis*, and *ima* as synonymous with *acuta*. This is decidedly the opinion of Sanadon, who investigates at great length the meaning of the passage. See also "Beattie on Music." I do not therefore consider the opinion of Gesner, recommended by the critic, to be of unquestionable authority.

BRACHIA—LACERTI.—It would be an act of injustice to the candor and liberality displayed through the whole of the learned critic's observations, if I entertained a conception, that he intended to impress his readers with a belief, that the author of the *Gymnasium* was indebted to Mr. Barker, for the explanation which he has given of these two terms. His language however, though I am persuaded, unintentionally, leads to this conclusion. His words are "Mr. Barker, in the 'Classical Recreations,' had pointed out the circumstance noticed by Dr. C. that the two passages quoted by Dumesnil in favor of his distinction militate directly against it." One would naturally infer from this, that the "Classical Recreations" had been published antecedently to the "Gymnasium." The reverse, however, is the fact. The "Gymnasium" was published three months before Mr. Barker's work made its appearance; and though there is a striking coincidence between his observations and mine, I am far from supposing that the ingenious and indefatigable author of that work was indebted to me for his very judicious remarks. The subject involves no difficulty; and it is rather a matter of surprise, that the common misconception of the terms in question has so long obtained among Lexicographers and Critics.

These are the only observations, which I have to offer in reply to the candid animadversions of the learned Reviewer. I cannot, however, dismiss his remarks, without repeating to him my thanks, for the liberality, which is exhibited in the whole of his critique; and the approbation, which he has bestowed on the subject of his Review.

Before I conclude, permit me to address a few observations to another Critic, to whom also I am indebted for a favorable report of the same work. (See *Critical Review*, V. 3. No. 3.)

In the first place, it is necessary to inform him, that, when I

expressed my opinion, of the inelegance, and the inaccuracy of the Latin compositions and translations, which have lately issued from the British press, I had no particular allusion to "Falconer's Strabo." My remark was general; nor can I easily conceive, how the Reviewer could either question or misapprehend my meaning.

It has been observed, in the "Gymnasium," that, when the accident or inflexion, not the word itself, is either obsolete or novel, it may be regarded as an offence against etymology, as *tumultuis* for *tumultus*, *duint* for *dent*, *amasso* for *amavero*, *jugas* for *jāga*. The Reviewer remarks, "Dr. C. is surely using the word Etymology in some sense very different from the usual acceptation of it; for with the exception of the word *duint*, not one other (he means, *not one*) of these examples can be said to offend against what is generally termed Etymology." This observation cannot fail to surprise every reader, who is but moderately conversant in the science of grammar. Let us examine it. In the first place, it may be inquired, why has the Reviewer excepted *duint*? Is it not precisely in the same predicament, with the other examples? Does not the error, involved in it, as well as in the other words, consist in improper inflexion? Why, then, is it excepted, the error being precisely of the same character, with that in *tumultuis* or *amasso*? The conceptions of the Reviewer on this subject seem to be neither clear, nor correct. In the next place, it appears necessary to inform the Reviewer of the two senses, in which the term *Etymology* is used by grammarians. It denotes then, 1st, that part of philological science, which consists in investigating the *etymons*, or *radices* of words. It traces the derivative to its primitive, and resolves the compound into the simple terms, of which it is composed. In this sense, it is called by Quintilian *originatio*. It denotes, 2dly, as the Reviewer should have known, before he hazarded his observation, the converse of this, namely, that part of grammar, by which we follow an *etymon* through its various inflexions and changes, including, therefore, the declension of nouns, and the conjugation of verbs. Is there any grammarian, who requires to be told, that the term is employed in this sense? Let him attend to the following definitions. "Etymology treats of the different sorts of words, and their derivations, and variations." (A. Murray.) "Etymology treats of the kinds of words, their derivation, change, analogy, or likeness to one another." (*British Grammar*.) "Etymology teaches the deduction of one word from another, and the various modifications, by which the same word is diversified, as *horse*, *horses*, *love*, *loved*." (S. Johnson.) Etymology is considered by Campbell in his "Rhetoric" as that part of grammar, which treats of inflexion. (See book 2, chap. 3.) "Etymologia est ea Gram-

maticæ pars, quæ singularum vocum naturas et proprietates explicat." (Ruddiman.) He divides grammar therefore into four parts, Etymology, Orthography, Syntax, and Prosody. Under the first division he includes the inflexion of nouns and verbs. Nor is this use of the term confined to the grammarians of this country. "Etymologia est scientia ostendens veram dictionum originem, cum reliquis accidentibus." (*Despauter Comment.*) Golius, in his Greek grammar, divides the art of speaking and writing Greek into four parts, Prosody, Etymology, Orthography, and Syntax. More evidence might be produced, if more were necessary. This surely may suffice to show, that the term *Etymology* is employed to denote that part of grammar, which treats of inflexion, and that every error, therefore, either in declension or conjugation, is an offence against Etymology.

I am aware, that Varro, with several other writers in imitation of him, have denominated by the term *Analogy* that part of grammar, which has been named by other writers and critics *Etymology*. But, though Varro has treated only of declension and conjugation under this head, it is evident, that, agreeably to his explanation of the term, the word admits a more extended signification. In fact every deviation from a general usage, or general rule, whether that deviation regard derivation, composition, declension, conjugation, orthoëpy, or syntax, is a violation of analogy. The term embraces all those resemblances and congruities, which we remark in the structure and phraseology of any language. It is a term, therefore, too general to specify the notion, which I intended to express. If this violation consist in false declension or conjugation, implying therefore the use of a word not belonging to the language, I consider it as that species of barbarism, which consists in an offence against Etymology. If the violation consist in deviating from the established rules of concord and government, I consider it as an offence against syntax, which error is denominated solecism.

The Reviewer, I apprehend, is slightly, if at all conversant in the art of teaching. He considers the distinction offered between *tum*, *igitur* & *inde* as unnecessary; and thinks the young student could scarcely err in the use of these adverbs, unless the English were deficient in perspicuity. The same observation he applies to the explanation, which I have given of *ducere* and *ferre*; and observes, that the scholar must be young indeed, who would be apt to confound them. The experienced teacher will naturally smile at the Reviewer's remarks; nor will he need to be told, that in Anglo-Latin translation the young pupil is apt to employ *tum* for *igitur*, *igitur* also for *tum*, and *inde* for both. Nor will he require to be informed, that a boy at school, who has been accustomed to render *capere* by "to take," and *ferre* "to carry,"

may ignorantly suppose, that the Latin verbs have the same extensive signification with the respective English verbs, and improperly employ *capere* for *ferre*, and also for *ducere*. The Reviewer perhaps may be surprised, when I assure him, that I have seen the passage in question, to which my observation refers, namely, "They took him to the Academy,"—*Eum ad Academiam ceperunt*. When he recommends, that an equivocal term, such as *take* for *conduct*, should not be employed, he betrays an ignorance of one of the principal advantages, which the young scholar derives from Anglo-Latin translation, and seems not to be aware, that the character of the style, as either formal or familiar, dignified or easy, may render the one term preferable to the other. Equivocal words are constantly occurring in oral and written language, without creating any ambiguity; and the young student should be taught to distinguish their various acceptations. If a teacher were to exclude from an English exercise every equivocal term, that is, every term having more significations than one, he would undertake an arduous task, and, if he even succeeded, would fail in the discharge of his duty as an instructor. In the last sentence, which I have written, in which, I trust, there is no obscurity, let the Reviewer say, how many words, as having more meanings than one, ought to be changed. More, I apprehend, than from his observations I should think he is aware of.

It was my intention to offer a few remarks respecting his distinction between *pugna* and *prælium*, and his acquaintance with Scheller. But I have already trespassed so far on the patience of the reader, as well as on your pages, Mr. Editor, that I must, for the present at least, relinquish my intention.

ALEX. CROMBIE.

Greenwich, 20th May, 1815.

THE LIFE OF ISAAC CASAUBON.

(AN EXTRACT.)

ISAAC CASAUBON, one of the most learned critics in the end of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth century, was born at Geneva, February 18, 1559, being the son of Arnold Casaubon and Jane Rosseau.¹ He was educated at first

¹ This Arnold was a native, and minister, of Bourdeaux, a village of Diois, in Dauphiné, but was obliged, on account of the persecution for religion, to fly to Geneva. When that ceased, he was chosen minister of

by his father, and being a youth of excellent parts, made so quick a progress in his studies, that at the age of nine years he could speak and write Latin with great ease and correctness. But his father being obliged, for three years together, to be always absent from home, on account of business, he was neglected, and entirely forgot what he had learned before. At twelve years of age he was forced to begin his studies again, and to learn as it were by himself; his father's frequent absence, and many avocations, hindering his attention to him, excepting at vacant times. But as he could not in this method make any considerable progress, he was sent, in 1578, to Geneva, to complete his studies under the professors there. By his indefatigable application, he quickly recovered the time he had lost. He learned the Greek tongue of Francis Portus, the Cretan, and soon became so great a master of that language, that this famous man thought him worthy to be his successor in the professor's chair, in 1582, when he was but three and twenty years of age. In 1586, Feb. 1, he had the misfortune to lose his father.¹ The 28th of April following, he married Florence, daughter of Henry Stephens, the celebrated printer,² by whom he had twenty children. For fourteen years he continued professor of the Greek tongue at Geneva; and in that time studied philosophy and the civil law under Julius Pacius. He also learned Hebrew, and other Oriental languages, but not enough to be able to make use of them afterwards.³ In the mean time he began to be weary of Geneva; either because he could not agree with his father-in-law, Henry Stephens, a morose and peevish man; or because his salary was not sufficient for his maintenance; or because he was of a rambling and unsettled disposition. He resolved, therefore, after a great deal of uncertainty, to accept the place of Professor of

Crest, in Dauphiné, and here it was, that his son Isaac learned the first rudiments of Grammar. That he was born at Geneva, he informs us himself; and, therefore, Moreri confounds the father with the son, when he says, that the latter was born at Bourdeaux.

¹ He died at Die, aged 63. Charles Bonarsus, and Andr. Endæmon-Joannes, have affirmed that he was hanged. But his son hath fully confuted that false and scandalous story.

² Who had withdrawn from Paris to Geneva. There had been a long intimacy between him and Casaubon; and that, probably, is what gave the enemies of the latter occasion to assert that he had spent his youth in correcting the books printed by H. Stephens: which indeed is false, though no blemish to his reputation, if it had been true.

³ About the year 1591, he fell into great trouble, of which he complains extremely in his letters, by being bound in a great sum for Mr. Wotton, an Englishman, which he was obliged to pay. This straitened him, till he was reimbursed by the care of his friends, and particularly of Joseph Scaliger, about a year after.

the Greek tongue and polite literature, which was offered him at Montpellier, with a more considerable salary than he had at Geneva. To Montpellier he removed about the end of the year 1596, and began his lectures in the February following. About the same time, the city of Nismes invited him to come and restore their university, but he excused himself. It is also said, he had an invitation from the university of Franeker, but that is not so certain. At his first coming to Montpellier, he was much esteemed and followed, and seemed to be pleased with his station. But this pleasure did not last long; for what had been promised him was not performed; abatements were made in his salary; which also was not regularly paid: in a word, he met there with so much uneasiness, that he was just upon the point of returning to Geneva. But a journey he took to Lyons in 1598 gave him an opportunity of taking another, that proved extremely advantageous to him. He had been recommended by some gentlemen of Montpellier to M. de Vicq, a considerable man at Lyons; this gentleman took him into his house, and carried him along with him to Paris, where he caused him to be introduced to the First-President de Harlay, the President de Thou, Mr. Gillot, and Nicholas le Fevre, by whom he was very civilly received. He was also presented to King Henry IV. who, being informed of his merit, would have him leave Montpellier for a professor's place at Paris. Casaubon, having remained for some time in suspense which course to take, went back to Montpellier, and resumed his lectures. Not long after, he received a letter from the king, dated January 3, 1599, by which he was invited to Paris, in order to be professor of polite literature. He set out for that city the 26th of February, following. When he came to Lyons, M. De Vicq advised him to stay there till the King's arrival, who was expected in that place. In the mean while, some domestic affairs obliged him to take a turn to Geneva, where he complains that justice was not done him with regard to the estate of his father-in-law. Upon his return to Lyons, having waited a long while in vain for the king's arrival, he took a second journey to Geneva, and then went to Paris; though he foresaw, as M. De Vicq and Scaliger had told him, he should not meet there with all the satisfaction he at first imagined. The king gave him, indeed, a gracious reception; but the jealousy of some of the other professors, and his Protestant tenets, procured him a great deal of trouble and vexation, and were the cause of his losing the professorship, of which he had the promise. Some time after, he was appointed one of the judges on the Protestants' side, at the conference between James Davy du Perron, Bishop of Evreux,

afterwards Cardinal, and Philip du Plessis-Mornay.¹ As Casaubon was not favorable to the latter, who, as we are assured, did not acquit himself well in that conference; it was reported that he would soon change his religion; but the event showed that this report was groundless. When Casaubon came back to Paris, he found it very difficult to obtain either his pension or the charges of removing from Lyons to Paris, because M. de Rosny was not his friend; so that it was not without an express order from the king that he obtained the payment even of three hundred crowns. The 30th of May, 1600, he returned to Lyons, to hasten the impression of his *Athenæus* which was printing there; but he had the misfortune of incurring the displeasure of his great friend M. de Vicq, who had all along entertained him and his whole family in his own house, when they were in that city, because he refused to accompany him into Switzerland. The reason of this refusal was his fear of losing in the mean time the place of library-keeper to the king, of which he had a promise, and that was likely soon to become vacant, on account of the librarian's illness. He returned to Paris with his wife and family the September following, and was well received by the king, and by many persons of distinction. There he read private lectures, published several works of the ancients, and learned Arabic; in which he made so great a progress, that he undertook to compile a dictionary, and translated some books of that language into Latin. In 1601 he was obliged, as he tells us himself, to write against his will to James VI. king of Scotland, afterwards king of England, but does not mention the occasion of it. That prince answered him with great civility, which obliged our author to write to him a second time. In the mean time, the many vexations which he received from time to time at Paris made him think of leaving that city, and retiring to some quieter place. But King Henry IV. would never permit him; and, in order to fix him, made an augmentation of two hundred crowns to his pension: and granted him the reversion of the place of his library-keeper, after the death of John Gosse-

¹ This conference was held at Fontainebleau, May 4, 1600. It was at first designed, that it should continue several days, but the indisposition of Mr. du Plessis-Mornay was the cause of its lasting but one. The other judge on the Protestants' side was Mr. Canaye, who convinced, as he pretended, by the arguments that were then used, became a convert to Popery. He used his utmost endeavours to persuade Casaubon to follow his example; but not being able to prevail, he grew very cool towards him, and ceased to have the same regard and friendship for him as he had, till then, expressed. As for Casaubon, he clears himself in several of his letters, of the imputation thrown upon him, of favoring Popery.

lin, the librarian. He took a journey to Dauphiné, in May, 1608, and from thence to Geneva, about his private affairs; returning to Paris on the 12th of July. Towards the end of the same year, he came into possession of the place of King's library-keeper, vacant by the death of Gosselin.¹ His friends of the Roman Catholic persuasion made now frequent attempts to induce him to forsake the Protestant religion. Cardinal du Perron, in particular, had several disputes with him upon that point: after one of which a report was spread, that he had then promised the Cardinal to become a Roman Catholic: so that in order to stifle that rumor, the ministers of Charenton, who were alarmed at it, obliged him to write a letter to the Cardinal, to contradict what was so confidently reported, and took care to have it printed. About this time, the magistrates of Nismes gave him a second invitation to their city, offering him a house, and a salary of six hundred crowns of gold a-year, but he durst not accept it, for fear of offending the king. In 1609, he had, by that prince's order, who was desirous of gaining him over to the Catholic religion, a conference with Cardinal du Perron, upon the controverted points; but it had no effect upon him, and he died a Protestant. The next year two things happened that afflicted him extremely; one was the murder of King Henry IV. which deprived him of all hopes of keeping his place; the other, his eldest son's embracing Popery.² The loss of the king, his patron and protector, made him resolve to come over into England, where he had often been invited by King James I. Having obtained leave of the Queen-Regent of France to be absent for a while out of that kingdom, he came to England in October 1610, with Sir Henry Wotton, ambassador extraordinary from king James I. He was received in England with the utmost civility by persons of learning and distinction.³ He waited upon the

¹ His possession of that place was a great advantage to him; not only on account of the salary, but because he had then free access to the books in that valuable library, which Gosselin would not permit him to have, as much as he desired or wanted.

² This last accident gave him a great deal of affliction and uneasiness; and the more, because a report was spread, that he himself had charged George Strauchan, a Scotchman, who taught his son the mathematics, to instruct him at the same time in the Popish religion.

³ But it seems he did not meet with the like treatment from the inferior sort of people. For he complains in one of his letters, that he was more insulted in London than he had ever been in Paris in the midst of the Papists; that stones were thrown at his windows night and day; that he received a great wound as he went to court; that his children were assaulted in the streets; and he and his family were sometimes pelted with

king, who took great pleasure in discoursing with him, and even did him the honor of admitting him several times to eat at his own table. His majesty likewise made him a present of a hundred and fifty pounds, to enable him to visit the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The 3d of January, 1611, he was made a denizen; and the 19th of the same month, the king granted him a pension of three hundred pounds: as also two prebends, one at Canterbury, and the other at Westminster. He likewise wrote to the Queen-Regent of France, to desire Casaubon might stay longer in England than she had at first allowed him. But Casaubon did not long enjoy these great advantages. For a painful distemper, occasioned by his having a double bladder, soon laid him in his grave. He died July 1, 1614, in the 55th year of his age; and was buried in Westminster-abbey.¹ He had, as is already hinted above, twenty children.² We shall give an account of his writings, and of the books he published, in the note.³ This

stones.—He doth not mention what were the grounds of those many incivilities to himself and family.

¹ Where there is a monument erected to his memory, with the following inscription:

*Isaacus Casaubonus,
(O Doctorem quicquid est, assurgite
Huic tam colendo Nomini)*

Quem Gallia Reip. literaria bono peperit, Henricus IV. Francorum rex invictissimus Lutetiam literis suis evocavit, Bibliotheca sua praecepit, chorumque deinceps dum vixit habuit; coque terris erepto Jacobus Mag. Brit. monarcha, Regum doctissimus, doctis indulgentiss. in Angliam accivit, munifice fovit, posteritasque ob doctrinam aeternam mirabitur, H. S. E. oracula major. Obiit aeternam in Christo vitam anhelans, Kal. Julii, 1614. Aetatis 55.

Viro opt. immortalitate digniss. Thomas Mortonus Episc. Duacelm. jucundissima quoad frui licuit consuetudinis memor. Pr. S. P. Cu. 163

*Qui nosse vult Casaubonum,
Non Sura sed Chartas legat
Superfuturas marmori,
Et profuturas posteris.*

² John, the eldest, turned Roman Catholic, as hath been mentioned above. Another, named *Augustin*, did the like, and became a Capuchin at Calais, where he was poisoned, with eleven others of the same order. Mr. Du Pin relates of him the following particular, upon the authority of Mr. Cotelier: before he took the vow of Capuchin, he went to ask his father's blessing, which the father readily granted him; adding, "My son, I do not condemn thee; nor do thou condemn me; we shall both appear before the tribunal of Jesus Christ." What became of the rest of his children (except Meric) is not known. In 1612, he had a son born in England, to which the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury were godfathers, and Sir George Cary's lady godmother.

³ They are as follow: I. *In Diogenem Laertium Notæ Isaaci Hortiboni. Morgis* 1583. 8vo. He was but twenty-five years old when he made these notes, and intended to have enlarged them afterwards, but was hindered. He dedicated them to his father, who commended him, but

great man received the highest encomiums from persons of learning in his time ; and he really deserved them, not only on account of his

told him at the same time, "He should like Letter on note of his upon the Holy Scriptures, than all the pains he could be tow upon profane authors." These notes of Casaubon were inserted in the editions of *Diongenes Laertius*, printed by H. Stephens in 1594 and 1593 in 8vo, and have been put in all other editions published since. The name of *Hortobonus*, which Casaubon took, is of the same import as *Casaubonus*, i. e. a good garden ; *Casan*, in the language of Dauphiné, signifying a garden, and *bon*, good. II. *Isaaci Hortoboni Lectiones Theoreticae*, in Crispinus's edition of Theophrastus, Geneva, 1584, 12mo, repeated several times since. III. *Strabonis Geographiae Libri xvii. Graece et Latine, et Gal. Xylondri Interpretatione, edente cum Commentariis Isaaco Casaubono*, Geneva, 1587, fol. Casaubon's notes were reprinted, with additions, in the Paris edition of Strabo in 1629, and have been inserted in all other editions since. IV. *Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum Notis Isaaci Casauboni in quatuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum*, Geneva, 1587, 16to. These notes were reprinted afterwards at the end of Whistock's edition of the New Testament, Lond., and inserted in the *Critica Sacra*. V. *Annadversiones in Dionysium Halicarnasensem*, in the edition of Dionysius Hiericarnasensis, published by our author with Amelius Portus's Latin version, Geneva, 1588, fol. These were written in haste, and are of no great value. VI. *Poluxeni Strategematum, Libri viii. Graece et Latine, edente cum Notis Isaaco Casaubono*, Lugduni, 1589, 16to. Casaubon was the first who published the Greek text of this author. The Latin version, joined to it, was done by Justus Vultem, and first published in 1550. VII. *Dicaearchi Geographica quaedam, sive de Statu Graeciae ; Ejusdem descriptio Graeciae versibus Graecis Iambicis, ad Theophrastum ; cum Isaaci Casauboni et Henrici Stephani notis*, Geneva, 1589, 8vo. VIII. *Aristotelis Opera Graece, cum rationum Interpretatione Latina, et variis Lectionibus et Castigationibus Isaaci Casauboni*, Lugduni, 1590, fol. Geneva, 1605, fol. These notes are only marginal, and were composed at leisure hours. IX. *C. Plinei C. Sec. Epist. Lib. ix. Ejusdem et Terentii uel Epist. amicitiae. Ejusdem Pl. et Paetii, Momestri, Nazarii Pungentii Item Claudii Pungentii. Adhuc sunt Isaaci Casauboni Nota in Epist.* Geneva, 1591, 12mo. *Ibid.* 1599, 1605, 1610, and 1611, 12mo. These notes are but very short. X. *Theophrasti Characteres Ethici Graece et Latine, ex versione et cum commentario Isaaci Casauboni*, Lugduni, 1592, 12mo and 1612, 12mo. This latter edition is the more exact of the two, being revised by the author. Casaubon's edition of Theophrastus is still highly esteemed, and was one of those works which procured him most reputation. Joseph Scaliger highly extols it. XI. *I. Apulei Apologia, cum Isaaci Casauboni Castigationibus. Typis Commatai*, 1593, 4to. In this edition, he showed himself as able a critic in the Latin, as he had done before in the Greek tongue. It is dedicated to Joseph Scaliger. XII. *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera cum Isaaci Casauboni Animadversionibus*, Geneva, 1595, 4to. Item editio altera emendata et aucta. Paris, 1610. This second edition is enlarged. XIII. *Publii Syri Mimi, sive sententiae selectae, Latine, Graece versa, et Notis illustrata per Jos. Scaligerum ; cum praefatione Isaaci Casauboni*, Lugd. Batav. 1598, 8vo. XIV. *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum, Libri xv. Graece et Latine, Interpretis Jacobo Dalechampio, cum Isaaci Casauboni Animadversionum, Libris xv. Lugdun.* 1600, 2 vol. fol. *Ibid.* 1612, 2 vol. fol. Casaubon's notes take up the second volume, and are very large, and full of great learning. XV. *Historiae Augustae Scriptores, cum commen-*

extensive knowledge, but likewise of his modesty, sincerity, and probity. Some writers, indeed, even of the reformed religion, have

tar. o Isaaci Casauboni. Paris 1603, 4to. reprinted at Paris in 1620, with Salmasius's Commentaries on the same authors, fol. and at Leiden, in 1670, 2 vol. 8vo. XVI. *De tribus ad Dionis Chrysostomi Orationibus*, published in the edition of that author by Frederick Morel, at Paris. 1604, fol. XVII. *Persii Satyræ et recensione et cum Commentar. Isaaci Casauboni.* Paris, 1605, 8vo. Lond. 1647, 8vo. These notes upon Persius are legues he had formerly read at Geneva. They were enlarged in the edition of 1647. Scalger used to say of them, "That the sauce was better than the fish." i. e. The commentary better than the text. XVIII. *De Satyrica Græcorum Poetæ, et Romanorum Satyra Libri duo.* Paris, 1605, 8vo. In this work Casaubon affirms, That the Satyr of the Latins was very different from that of the Greeks. In this he is contradicted by Daniel Heinsius, in his two books, *De Satyra Horatiana.* Lugd. Batava 1629, 12mo. But the learned Ezekiel Spanhem, after having examined the arguments of these two learned men, hath declared for Casaubon. Crenius hath inserted this tract of Casaubon, in his *Museum Philologicum et Historicum.* Lugd. Batav. 1699, 8vo. and also the following piece, which was published by our author, at the end of his two books, *De Satyrica poetæ, &c.* XIX. *Cyclops Euripidis Latinitate donata a Q. Septimio Florento.* XX. *Gregorii Nyseni Epistola ad Eustathium, Ambrosium, et Basilium, Græce, et Latine, cum notis I. Casauboni.* Paris, 1601, 8vo. Hanovæ, 1607, 8vo. This letter was first published by Casaubon. XXI. *De Libertate Ecclesiastica Liber.* 1607, 8vo. pages 261. This book was composed by the author during the disputes between Pope Paul V. and the republic of Venice; and contained a vindication of the rights of sovereigns against the encroachments of the court of Rome. But those differences being adjusted while the book was printing, King Henry IV. caused it to be suppressed. However, Casaubon having sent the sheets, as they came out of the press, to some of his friends, some of the copies were preserved. Meibner Goldast inserted that fragment in his *Collectanea de Monarchia S. Imperii*, Tom. I. pag. 674, and Almeloveen reprinted it in his edition of our author's letters. XXII. *Inscriptio vetus dedicationem fundi continens, ab Herode Rege facta, cum Notis Isaaci Casauboni.* This small piece, published in 1607, hath been inserted by T. Crenius in his *Museum Philologicum.* Casaubon's notes are short, but learned: however, he appears to have been mistaken, in ascribing the inscription on which they were made to Herod, King of Judæa, instead of Herodes the Athenian. XXIII. *Polybii Opera, Græce, et Latine ex versione Isaaci Casauboni.* Accedit *Aeneas Tractatus de toleranda obsidione, Græce et Latine.* Paris, 1609, fol. et Hanovæ, 1609, fol. The Latin version of these two authors was done by Casaubon; who intended to write a commentary upon them, but went no farther than the first book of Polybius, being prevented by death. What he did of that was published after his decease. The great Thuanus, and Fronto Ducaeus, the Jesuit, were so pleased with the Latin version, that they believed it was not easy to determine, whether Casaubon had translated Polybius, or Polybius Casaubon—*ut non facile dici posse crederent, Polybiumne Casaubonus, an Casaubonum Polybius convertisset.* At the head of this edition there is a dedication to King Henry IV. which passes for a master-piece of the kind. And, indeed, Casaubon had a talent for such pieces, as well as for prefaces. In the former, he praises without low servility, and in a manner remote from flattery: in the latter, he lays open the design and excellencies of the

undervalued him, and called him a half-divine. But the reason was, because he did not entirely agree with their sentiments in

books he publishes, without ostentation, and with an air of modesty. So that he may serve as a model for such performances. XXIV. He published *Josephi Scaligeri Opuscula varia*. Paris, 1610, 4to. Et Francofurti, 1612, 8vo. with a preface of his own. XXV. *Ad Frontonem Ducaum Epistola, de Apologia, Jesuitarum nomine, Parisiis edita*. Londini, 1611, 4to. Casaubon, after his coming to England, was forced to alter the course of his studies, and to write against the Papists, in order to please his patron, King James I., who affected to be a great controversialist. He began with this letter, dated July 2, 1611, which is the 730th in Almeloveen's collection, and for which King James made him a considerable present. It is a confutation of *la Reponse Apologétique à l'Anti-colon, par François Bonald. Au Pont*. 1611, 8vo. XXVI. *Epistola ad Georgium Michaellem Lingelsheimum de quodam libello Sciopii*, 1612, 4to. This letter is dated Aug. 9, 1612, and is the 828th of Almeloveen's collection. XXVII. *Epistola ad Cardinalem Perronium*. Londini, 1612, 4to. This letter, which is the 838th in Almeloveen's collection, is dated Novemb. 9, 1612. It is not so much Casaubon's own composition, as an exact account of the sentiments of King James I., whose, and the Church of England's, secretary he was, as he tells us, with regard to some points of religion. Accordingly, it was inserted in the edition of that King's works, published in 1619 by Dr. Montague, Bishop of Winchester. It is written with moderation. Cardinal du Perron undertook to give an answer to it, which was left unfinished at his death. It has been likewise animadverted upon by Valentine Smalcus, the Socinian, in his *Ad Isaacum Casaubonum Parænesis*. Racoviae, 1614, 4to. published under the name of Anton. Reuchlin. XXVIII. *De Rebus sacris et Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes xvi. Ad Cardinalis Baronii Prolegomena in Annales, et primam eorum partem, de Domini nostri Jesu Christi Nativitate, Vita, Passione, Assumptione*. Londini, 1614, fol. Francofurti, 1615, 4to. Genevæ, 1655 et 1663, 4to. What was the occasion of this work we learn from Mr. Bernard: namely, That soon after Casaubon's arrival in England, Peter de Moulin wrote to Dr. James Montague, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, to inform him, that Casaubon had a great inclination to Popery; that there were only a few articles, which kept him among the Protestants; and that if he returned to France, he would change his religion, as he had promised. Therefore, he desired him to endeavour to keep him in England, and to engage him in writing against the Annals of Baronius, since he knew *that he had materials ready for that purpose*. Accordingly, King James employed him in that work, which was finished in eighteen months' time. Nicéron thinks, that Casaubon was not equal to this work, because he had not sufficiently studied divinity, chronology, and history, and was not conversant enough in the Fathers. So that he is charged with having committed more errors than Baronius in a less compass. Besides, as he comes no lower than the year 34 after Christ, he is said to have pulled down only the pinnacles of Baronius's great building. It appears from letter 1059th of our author, that Dr. Richard Montague, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, had undertaken to write against Baronius at the same time with himself; and he threatens to complain of him to the King, who had engaged him in that work. XXIX. *Ad Polybii Historiarum Librum primum Commentarius*. Paris, 1617, 8vo. See above, No. XXIII. XXX. *Isaaci Casauboni Epistolæ*. Hugæ Conin. 1638, 4to. published by John Frederick Gronovius. A second edition—*Octoginta duabus Epistolis auctior, et juxta seriem tempo-*

every point. For though he was a Protestant, he disapproved of some of Calvin's notions: and whoever doth so is sure to be branded, by the bigotry of a zealot, with the odious name of heretic, if not worse.

ADDITIONAL ANECDOTES, by DR. KIPPIS.

In Sir William Musgrave's collection there is a citation from the History of Europe, Vol. I. p. 163, which asserts that Isaac Casaubon was born at Bourdeaux, in 1555, and died in 1613. This account is erroneous in three respects: in the place of his birth, in the time of it, and in the year of his death. The same history, with manifest inconsistency, represents Casaubon as dying when fifty-five years old, though that was in fact the case: for if he was born in 1555, he must, in 1613, have, at least, been in the 58th year of his age.

When Isaac Casaubon formed, in 1610, the design of residing in this country, Dr. Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote the following letter to Sir Thomas Edmondes, the English ambassador at the court of France:

rum digesta—was published afterwards by John George Grævius; at Magdeburgh, and Helinstadt, 1650, 4to. These editions are eclipsed by the following one; intitled, *Is. Casauboni Epistolæ, insertis ad easdem responsionibus, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, secundum seriem temporis accurate digestæ. Accedunt huic Editioni, præter trecentas ineditas Epistolas, Is. Casauboni vita, ejusdem Dedicaciones, Præfationes, Prolegomena, Poëmata, Fragmentum de Libertate Ecclesiastica. Item Merici Casauboni Epistolæ, Dedicaciones, Præfationes. Prolegomena, et Tractatus quidam rariiores. Curante Theodoro Janſon ab Almeloeren. Roterodami, 1709, fol.* The letters in this volume are 1059 in number, placed according to the order of time in which they were written; and 51 without date. A certain writer finds in them neither elegance of style, nor fineness of thoughts; and censures, as very disagreeable, the mixture of Greek words and expressions that are dispersed throughout; affirming besides, that they contain no particulars tending to the advancement of learning, or that are of any great importance. Another owns, that there is in them the history of a man of probity and learning; but nothing otherwise very remarkable, excepting the purity of the language, and the marks of a frank and sincere mind. One author, on the other hand, assures us, that they are all perfectly beautiful; and makes no scruple to compare them to those of Grotius and Scaliger with regard to learning; and to assert that they exceed them for the easiness and purity of the style, which is entirely epistolary, and not at all affected. XXXI. In 1710 were published, *Casauboniana, sive Isaaci Casauboni varia de Scripturibus Librisque judicia, Observationes sacræ in utriusque Fæderis Loca, Philologica item Ecclesiasticæ, ut et Animadversiones in Annales Baronii Ecclesiasticos ineditæ, ex variis Casauboni MSS. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana reconditis nunc primum erutæ a Jo. Christophero Wolfio, &c. Accedunt duæ Casauboni Epistolæ ineditæ, et Præfatio ad Librum de Libertate Ecclesiastica, cum Notis Editoris in Casauboniana, ac Præfatio, qua de hujus generis Libris disseritur. Hamburgi, 1710, 8vo.* There is nothing very material in this collection. M.

" My very good Lord,

" Mons. Casaubon purposeth (as I take it) to come over into England with his wife and family. His Majesty hath already bestowed upon him a prebend in Canterbury; and somewhat else will be shortly thought upon for his better maintenance. I pray your lordship, when he shall repair unto you for that purpose, deliver unto him thirty pounds towards his charges of transporting, which my Lady Edmondes, your wife, hath received from me, as by your letter here inclosed may appear. And so, with my hearty commendations, I commit your lordship to the tuition of Almighty God.

" At Lambeth the 26th of June, 1610,

" Your Lordship's assured loving friend,

" R. CANT.

" This must be kept close, lest he be prevented or murdered in his journey.

" Thus. R. C."

On the Christmas day after Casaubon arrived in England, he received the communion in the King's chapel, though he did not understand the language. This circumstance is mentioned in his diary, in which he declares, that he had carefully considered the office for the sacrament the day before; that he highly approved of it; and that he greatly preferred it to the manner of receiving in other churches. *Gratias tibi Domine, quod hodie ad sacramentum sum admissus, et corporis sanguinisque factus sum particeps in ecclesia Anglicana, cujus formulam heri diligenter meditatus admodum probavi, et ordinem agendi mire laudavi præ recepta apud alios consuetudine.*

From the whole article of Casaubon it may be collected, that he was somewhat of a restless disposition; and it appears, that, though he met with such encouragement in England, he was not satisfied with his new situation. This occasioned Sir Dudley Carleton to write severely concerning him, in a letter to Sir Thomas Edmondes. "I am sorry" (says Sir Dudley) "Mr. Casaubon, or rather his wife, doth not know when she is well. The conditions he hath in England are such, that some principal scholars of Germany, who are as well and better at home than he in France, would think themselves happy to have: and so I have understood from them since my coming hither. If ever he turn his religion, we shall see him a wretched contemptible fellow, or else I am a false prophet." It is certain, that Casaubon was not pleased with the manners of the English; and, in a letter to Thuanus, he complains, that those who were acquainted with him before he came to England now treated him as a perfect stranger, and took not the least notice of him by conversation or otherwise. *Ego mores Anglicanos non capio: quoscumque ipse*

habui notos priusquam huc venirem, jam ego illis sum ignotus, vere peregrinus, barbarus : nemo illorum me vel verbulo appellat, appellatus silet.

The ingenious writer of the Confessional owns, that he is one of those who do not rate Casaubon's integrity so high as his knowledge ; whilst Burigny, on the other hand, says that he joined the most profound erudition with the most perfect probity.

Isaac Casaubon is to be ranked amongst those learned men who, in the beginning of the last century, were very solicitous to have an union formed between the Popish and Protestant religions. This is expressly asserted by Burigny, in his life of Grotius. According to that biographer, Casaubon, who wished to see all Christians united in one faith, ardently desired a re-union of the Protestants with the Roman Catholics, and would have set about it, had he lived longer in France. He greatly respected the opinions of the ancient church, and was persuaded that its sentiments were more sound than those of the ministers of Charenton. Grotius and he had imparted their sentiments to each other before the voyage to England ; and Arminius had a project of the same kind, which he communicated to Casaubon, by whom it was approved. Several divines, at that period, looked upon a scheme of this nature as practicable, and, among the rest, Huetius did not think it to be absolutely chimerical. Bayle, with much superior sagacity, entertained the opposite opinion. He believed that the attempt to unite the different religions was as great a chimera as the philosopher's stone, or the quadrature of the circle. Indeed, from what Burigny observes, nothing of the kind could ever take place : for that writer treats it as absolutely ridiculous to suppose that the Church of Rome, though she might remit some point of her discipline, would extend her indulgence so far as to give up transubstantiation, or any other of her doctrines. It is well known how zealously Grotius engaged in this idle project ; on which account it is not strange that he could not find out Popery in the prophesies of scripture. Though, therefore, he was, in general, so excellent a commentator, little regard is to be paid to his authority, where the Roman Catholic religion is concerned. The peculiar bias of his mind prevented him from discerning what, we apprehend, could not have escaped an impartial critic.

It may, at present, appear surprising that several learned men should formerly have been so much captivated with the idea of effecting an union between the Protestants and the Papists. But we shall the less wonder at this circumstance, when we consider the state of men's minds at that time. Numbers, even of the professed Protestants, had not shaken off all reverence for the apparent dignity and antiquity of the church of Rome. The extravagancies,

ἥπιος γὰρ ᾔσθαι· τὸ δ' ὄρθ' οὐδέυναι,
εἰσαεῖ¹ τέτραψο πρὸς ἱθύ· κούχι
ἤμπλακες σκόπου, μεγὰ σεμνότημος
 μειλίχιος περ.
¹ Ἀλλὰ τίφθ' οὕτως τι λύρα γώωδες
πένθυμόν τ' ἠχεῖ μέλος; οὐ τέθνακεν·
οὐχὶ δὴ καὶ γάρ² μακαρῶν ἐν αἷα
 τὸν βίοτον ζῇ,
τρίσμακαρ, τρισόλβιος. Ὡς θέλοιμι³ ἀν-
εύσεβων θανεῖν θάνατον, καθεύδων
Χριστοῦ ἐν βραχίουσιν ἀμβρότοις ἐ-
 γέρσιμον ὕπνον.
¹ Δῶμ' ἐμόν,⁴ σέ δὲ στεφάνοισιν ὕμνων
στήψομεν· τεαῖς γὰρ ἐν ἀγκαληῇσι,
παῖς ἔτ' αὖν, τραφεὶς κορυφαῖς ἅπαντος
 δέξασθαι⁵ ἐπαίνου·
ἐνθ' ἂρ' ἐν καλᾷ νεότητος ὥρᾳ
ἡϋξεθ' ἧς ψυχῆς σθένος· εἵτά νιν τὺ
γηροβοσκήσας· τὰ δὲ νῦν στέγεις τε-
 ω̃ ἐνὶ κόλπῳ
τὸν σπόδον⁶ γέροντα.—σέ γὰρ φίλασε,
φίλτατον δῶμ', ὥσπερ ἐγὼ φιλω̃ σε,
σφόδρα, σοὶ φρενῶν⁷ καθαράν ανοίξας
 κλήδα βαλιστᾶν.

HASTINGS ROBINSON, B. A.

Coll. Div. Joän. Cant. Schol.

xvii. cal. Apr. A. S. MDCCCXV.

¹ Cf. *Iliad*, \approx 403.

² Eurip. Bacch. 1337. Cf. Helen. 1693. Callistr. Scol. in Harmod. et Aristog. Pind. Olymp.

³ Collegium Divi Joannis.

* Vide Porson. ad Orest. 614.

⁵ Hujus constructionis exempla dabunt Eurip. Orest. 522. 1168. Horat. Epist. i. 19. 19. Ad Pisones, 18.

⁶ Eurip. Med. 658.

ODE GRÆCA

Numismate annuo, quod olim legavit D. GULIELMUS BROWNE, Eques, donata, et in curiâ CANTABRIGIENSI Comitiiis, quæ vocant, Maximis recitata.

In augustissimum Galliæ regem solio avito redditum.

ἌΣΤΥΧΟΝ πέριξ ψοφέων κάχλαζε
οἴδατος γελάσμασι μυρίοισιν
ἀφρὸς ἄχνας πορφυρέας· τὸ δ', αὔρα,
ποντίας αὔρα,
ἄβρὸν ὠρανῶ κελάδημα, πρῆσιν
ἰστίου κόλπον βαθύν· εὖ δι' ὕγρην,
πορθμὶς εὐπτερος, πλάκα θρώσκει, Νηρή-
δων ἀκόλουθος,
αἵτινες τέγγουσι δρόσῳ θαλάσσας
τὰν χλιδὰν τᾶς κυανέας ἐθειράς, 10
ἴσθι Γαλλίας κατάγοισ' ἄνακτ' ἐς
πατρίδα γαῖαν.
Ἐν ζυγοῖς ἔστακεν ἄναξ, πατρίαν
αἶαν ἰμέρρων ἰδέειν· γεγηθὸς
θάκρυν, μῆνυμα χαρᾶς ἀναυδον,
ὥς ἐτρόμησε
καλὸν εἰν ὅσσοις, ὅτε πρῶτον ὄψις
φιλτάτας' ἔσαινε πάτρας γέροντα·
φῶς δ' ἐπ' αἰγλάεντι χυθὲν προσώπῳ
εὐθύς ἔλαμψεν. 20
“ Ἄρα πατρίδος, χρονία περ, αἰγὰ
“ αὖθις ἐμπαίει κραδίᾳ συνήθης ;
“ ἄ πτοᾷ ψυχὰν γλυκύπικρος ἄδο-
“ νά μοι ἰδόντι
“ τὰν πάλαι ζαλαῖς ἔριδος δυσόμβριος
“ γᾶν σαλεύουσιν. Πατρίς, ᾧ πονοίσας
“ εὐτυχὴς Ἐλευθερίας παλαίστρα,
“ χαῖρε μάλ' αὖθις,

“ τὴν γὰρ, ὦ μέλημα φρενὸς φίλιστον,
 “ τευχέων ἄχαλκος ἄγω γλυκεῖαν 30
 “ εὐδίαν· ὄρφναν κατέδου σκοτεῖναν

“ οὐλῖος ἄστηρ,
 “ ὅσπερ ἀστράπτων ἀπὸ δαδὸς αἴγλαν
 “ τᾶς φθισιμβρότου στεροπᾶς, ἐπ’ αἶαν
 “ φοινῖαν ὥρουσεν Ἑριν, κύνας δ’ ἔ-

“ σείσεν ἀφύκτους·
 “ Ζεὺς δ’ ἀπ’ ὠρανῶ χθόνα νῦν ἄπασαν
 “ χρυσέαις βρέξει νιφάδεσσι πλούτου,
 “ σὰν δι’ Εἰράνα, χάριν αὖ βαθεῖα 40
 “ τέρψις ὁμιλεῖν

“ ἐντὶν οἰνηρᾶν κυλίκων· ἀρούραις
 “ εἰν ἀκηράτοις ἁρότους ἀνείε
 “ Γαῖα, καὶ στάχυς, Ζεφύροιο κινουῖν-
 “ τος, ψιθυρίζει.

“ Ἀλλ’ ὅτ’ Ἀγγλίας ἀλίκλυστον ἀκτὰν,
 “ Ἀλῖ, αὐγάξεις φλογί, χρυσόνωντον
 “ ἀνίαν ἐπίσχες, ἔπος δὲ τοῦτ’ ἄγ-
 “ γειλον, ὅτ’ ἐν μοι

“ μνάμοσιν δέλτοις φρενῶν ἔγραψα
 “ οὔνομ’ ἀείμναστον ἑόν· τολοιπὸν 50
 “ ἔσσεται πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἔρις, φί-
 “ λα τις ἀμοιβά.

Λοίγιος βέβακε Δίκας μιάστωρ,
 παμμάχοις φραδαῖσι βρύων.—ἴν’ ἐσσί,
 Αἶετ’, ἐν λαβραῖσι πάλαι θυέλλαις
 “ ἄγεμονεύων;

“ Ὅτρεις ἐξάνθοῖσα τοιοῦτον αἰεὶ
 “ καρπον οὐ κομιστεον ἐξάμνησεν·
 “ Αἶετ’, ἀκταῖσιν φυγὰς ἐν μόναισι
 “ πολλὰ βεβρυχῶς 60

“ λυγρὸν ἀντλήσεις βίοτον, ἡ πρόσουρος
 “ αὐτὸς ὦν· σὲ δ’ εἴλε Δίκας ἄγρευμα
 “ οὐχὶ συγχεύσοντα πόλεις, ἀναλκιν,
 “ ἄμμορον αἰεὶ

“ τοῦ βροτοφθόρου κράτεος.” — κακῶς τὸ
 ἱστορεῖς τὸ μέλλον, ἀναξ· γλυκεῖα
 φρόντισι οὐκ ἔτ’ ἐντί. Πέρα διῆξεν
 ἔκβασιν ἄτας

εὐπετεῖ πηδήματι Κυρνοκέλτας·
 παρβέβακεν Ἀσυχία· πέδον δὲ
 αὖθις ἀστράπτει κατάχαλκον οὐ παι- 70
 ῶνιον αἰγάν.

“Ὡς ποτ’ εὐρρεῖος παρὰ νῆμα Δίρκας
 χρυσοπήληκα στάχυν ἐξάνηκεν
 αἶα, γᾶς λόχευμα φίλας, ὁ δ’ αἰθήρ
 δουριτίνακτος

οὐλίον μέμηνε, πάρος περ ἄβρᾶ
 ἄτρεμ’ ἐν πολίᾳ ψοφείων· ὅπλων δὲ
 πύρφορος τηλαυγὲς ἐκίδνατ’ αἶγλα
 θυμοραϊστέων. 80

Τὴν μακραίων τις βίητος, γεραῖε,
 ταῦθ’ ὀρῶντι πάματ’ ἀελπτ’ ἐφάνθη·
 ἦ ῥ’ ἀδήριτον σθένος ἐντ’ Ἀνάγκας,
 ἦ ῥ’ ἀδάμαστον.

“Ὀλβιος γὰρ ἦσθα τὸ πρίν· πάλαι σοὶ
 ἀλγέων ἄγευστος ἔλαμψεν αἰὼν
 εὐδίας δρέποντι φέριστον ἄνθος

Ἀσυχίας τε.
 “Ὡς ἄρ’ ὥφελεν τόδε δαρὸν ἔμμεν·
 ἃ γὰρ ἡμερος δυσέριως ἔπεισε 90
 σκαῖπτον ἀμφέπειν σε, τάλας, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ
 γήραος οὐδῶ.

Τὼς χαρὰ κακὸν τε βροτοῖς κυκλοῦνται
 πᾶσιν, οἳ” Ἀρκτου στροφάδες κέλευθοι.
 Οὐχὶ δὴν τάνθρώπιν· ἀμαυρὸν ὡς σκι-
 ᾶς ὄναρ ἔπτα.

Πρὸς τὰδ’ ὦν τύραννος ἄγαν χλιδάτω
 ὕψι χερσὶν ραβδονομῶν.—τοιαύταν
 πρᾶξιν εὖ βεβῶσαν ἰδὼν τις ὃν πρὸς
 θυμὸν ἂν εἴποι, 100

“ Πᾶ ποχ’ Ἄλιος φαέθων, βρότεια
 “ πάντ’ ἐπισκοπῶν φλογί, πᾶ κέραννοι
 “ Ζητὸς ἄγριπνοι, τὰδ’ ὀρῶντες εἰ κρύπ-
 “ τουσιν ἔκηλοι ;”

Viden? juvena et terribili ferox
 Stat Divus arcu. Quam gracili pede!
 Quam veste candenti decorus,
 Ad tremulum fluitante ventum!
 Talis, dici Rex, volat aurea
 Rota superbus: Sic Lyciæ juga 70
 Transcurrit, aut molli renodans
 Ambrosios premit arte crines.
 Et tu, Britanni gloria Phidiæ,
 Stans in verenda sede puertiæ,
 Quam Camus allabens adorat
 Composita taciturnus unda!
 Tune ingruentem jam magis ac magis
 Audis procellam, ruptaque fulmina?
 An surda nil curas imago,
 Quid piceæ meditentur umbræ? 80
 O si, refracta compele, melleos
 Ulla, illa tandem lingua daret sonos!
 O si Promethea caleret
 Forma semel rediviva flamma!
 Elheu!—quid auras, quid juvat irritis
 Vexare votis? Tu tenebris jaces
 Extinctus; Ah! nunquam Britannum,
 Chathamide, rediture cælum.
 Te nempe somnus, te gelidus tenet
 Amplexus Orci, et nigra silentia: 90
 Nos “rursus in bellum resorbens
 Unda fretis tulit æstuosis.”

G. STAINFORTH.

Trin. Coll. 1815.

SIR WILLIAM BROWNE'S MEDALS.

As I perceive that the Poems, which are annually rewarded with the gold medals, left by Sir William Browne, Knt. to the University of Cambridge, are generally inserted in the pages of your Journal, the following brief account of those prizes may with propriety be entitled to a place there as well.

These medals, which are three in number, are cast in the same mould. They are valued at five guineas each; and were directed to be given away annually, on the Commencement-day, to three under-

graduates; the first of whom should write the best Greek Ode in imitation of Sappho; the second, the best Latin Ode in the style of Horace; and the third, the best pair of Epigrams, one of which must be in Greek, and framed after the pattern of those in the 'Anthologia—the other in Latin, and after the manner of Martial.

The first and second were instituted in the year 1775; the third not till the year after. Although, however, it seems to have been the intention of the founder that these medals should be given to *different* undergraduates, yet this restriction,² wisely enough, seems never to have been considered as at all existing; so that any two, or all of the, may be gained by one and the same person.

On one side of the medals, which are about $\frac{1}{4}$ inches in circumference, is a head of Sir William Browne, in full dress as President of the College of Physicians at London. The motto round it is, ESSE ET VIDERI. At the bottom, and in two concentric circular lines,

D. GVLIELMVS BROWNE, EQVES.
NAT. III. NON. IAN. A. I. MDCXCII.

On the reverse is a figure of Apollo, seated upon a sort of ³tripod; his left hand rests upon his lyre; and, in his right, he is holding forth a crown of ⁴laurel to the successful candidate, who is represented in his Academical uniform, and, in a kneeling posture, is presenting him with a copy of his performance. The motto is, SVNT SVA PRAEMIA LAVDI. Underneath the whole, and in three lines, are the words—

ELECTVS COLL. MED.
LOND. PRAESES A. S.
MDCCLXV.

Some account of Sir W. Browne may be seen in *Nichols's Anecdotes of Bowyer*.

1815.

Yours,

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

P. S. I have often heard it objected as a defect in University and College Prizes, that, in general, there is nothing appended to them, by which the exact nature may be specified of the merit which has obtained them. In this objection there is certainly something reasonable. Where *medals* are the instruments of reward, the distinction might be made, by recording upon the rim⁵ the purpose for which they are given, the date, the name of the successful student, and that of the College to which he belongs.

¹ In the Anthologia, which consists of a collection of Greek Epigrams of all kinds and of all ages, a candidate for the prize must be cautious what sort of Greek he stumbles upon.

² Such a regulation, if it could have been mentioned to Sir William Browne during his life-time, must necessarily have received his consent.

³ Ὅς θεσπιωδεῖ τρίποδος ἐν χρυσήλατον. Aristoph. Plut. 9.

⁴ Laureâ donandus Apollinari. Hor. Odd. iv. 2. 9.

⁵ For example, the medal for the Greek Ode might be concisely distinguished thus—*Ode Graeca*, 1775. *Gul. Cole, Coll. Regal.*

Where the prizes are given in *books*, the difficulty is easily removed. The examiner might specify the nature of the prize, &c. upon the reverse of the title-page. This is uniformly the case in the German Universities, where it is done in Latin. Wherever this distinction is wanting, the prize *per se*, in my opinion, loses the better half of its value.

I conclude with proposing, as an improvement, that the Seatonian and Hulsean prizes, and also those awarded by the representatives of the University in Parliament, which are now given entirely in ~~money~~, be given partly in books; and that those books bear upon them ~~the~~ arms of the University. It never was intended that prizes of this nature should be considered as matter of emolument, but of honor exclusively.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IN the 10th Psalm occurs the phrase אֵין אֱלֹהִים כָּל-מִוְתָּוִי, that is, "All his thoughts, or, all his machinations and skill (are) there is no God." Why? because, as we find in the preceding phrase, "the wicked man is not humble enough even to make the research," or, "through arrogance, will not make the research." Surely the strength of this phrase not only suits the passage much better than "neither is God in all his thoughts," but is supported by the 14th Psalm in the expression: "The fool hath said in his heart, *There is no God.*"

First Epistle to the Corinthians, 11th chap. 2d—10th verse. In the last or 10th verse, the present translation draws a most extraordinary and inconsistent conclusion from the preceding arguments: "For this cause ought the woman to have *power* on her head, because of the angels." In a Letter addressed, with permission, to the late learned Dr. Ross, then Bishop of Exeter, I attempted to prove, that some hasty copyist must have changed the inverted and mutilated Σ into Ν in ἐξουσίαν, "power," and formed into one word the two words ἐξ οὐσίας, that is, "conformably to nature or sex." For this cause ought the woman ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, i. e. be covered, as equivalent to ἔχειν κατὰ κεφαλῆς, in the fourth verse. Thus the argument and conclusion upon the *sexual* duty of the woman in this case will be consistent. Query—Would not ἐγγέλους, instead of ἀγγέλους, be preferable, or at least admissible? "For this cause ought the woman to be covered conformably to her sex, on account of the scoffers or busy-mockers."

London, 18 Aug. 1815.

JOHN HAYTER.

NO. XXIII.

Cl. JI.

VOL. XII.

N

LOCKETT'S ARABIC SYNTAX.

The *Miut Amil*, and *Shurhoo Miut Amil*, two Elementary Treatises on Arabic Syntax.

In the Classical Journal, No. XIII. p. 234, we announced, on the authority of a letter from Calcutta, that Captain Lockett of the Bengal Military Establishment, Examiner in the Arabic, Persian, and Hindoostanee languages, and Secretary in the College of Fort William, had long been engaged in translating and preparing for publication some of the most valuable treatises relating to the Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic of the Arabs, as cultivated in Eastern seminaries. We now hasten to inform our Readers, that the late Indian fleet has brought to this country a few copies of his *Miut Amil*, printed during the last year (1814) at Calcutta, in a handsome 4to Volume, of about three hundred pages.

The *Miut Amil*, translated in the first part of this work, must not be confounded with those numerous compositions which, under the title of Arabic Grammars, teach little more than the alphabet, and most simple elements of the language; teaching even that little in such a manner as rather to discourage than allure a student--surrounding that which is not in itself very clear or easy with additional obscurity and difficulties. Syntax, that important subject, has been, in the works to which we allude, but superficially illustrated; and the Eastern writers themselves, who discuss its refinements, have generally indulged, as Captain Lockett observes, "in little verbal quibbles and philological fopperies, which tend, more or less, to disgrace almost every work on Arabic grammar."—(Preface, p. ii.) Of these blemishes the *Miut Amil* affords but a few instances, as its author, *Abdoolqahir*, emphatically styled *Alnuhwee*, or the Grammarian (See Pref. p. xv.), displays, within the compass of five quarto pages, "so much skill and ingenuity, and combines at the same time so many excellencies of brevity, order, perspicuity, and precision, that it may be fairly considered, on the whole, as the most judicious compendium of Arabic regimen that has yet appeared in the language." (Pref. p. i.)

Of this distinguished author, whose name D'Herbelot writes *Abdalcaker*, and Meninski *Abdelkaker*, and whom his commentator (perhaps *Ibn Hisham*) styles "the most excellent of the learned," so scanty are the biographical records, that Captain Lockett has been able to ascertain but very few circumstances respecting him. It appears that he composed many celebrated treatises on Grammar and Rhetoric, and died in the year 474 of the Hejira, or 1081 of the Christian era. (Pref. p. xv.)

"Abdoolqahir," says Capt. Lockett, "appears to be the first grammarian who reduced the governing powers of the Arabic language to a definite number; and as he lived at a time when Grecian literature

of every kind was ardently cultivated in Arabia, and when, in fact, almost every learned Arab made a merit of studying and copying the philosophical writings of the Greeks, it is not very improbable that the *Centiloquium* of Ptolemy,¹ a work on astrology, which must have been popular at that period in Arabia, gave him the first hint for the title of his treatise on regimen, and produced the *Miut Amil*, or *Hundred governing Powers*." (Pref. p. xvi.)

For the brevity of Abdoolqahir's work, his commentator, in the *Shurhoo Miut Amil*, compensates; and, still more, that able and ingenious orientalist to whom we are indebted for the English version of both those compositions, and for his own admirable illustrations, evincing a critical knowledge not only of the Arabic, but of general grammar, extensive and intimate acquaintance with the Greek and Latin classics, and with modern books of merit in almost every language, and the happy art of enlivening a dull subject.

It is not consistent either with the nature or limits of our Journal to follow the original author, his commentator, or their learned translator, Captain Lockett, through the mazes of Arabic syntax; but the following extract (See Pref. p. xi.) will sufficiently explain the method adopted by *Abdoolqahir*—"He divides Regimen into two general classes, or departments, termed verbal and absolute. By the first is simply understood, the effect that one word has upon the termination of another; by the second is meant, that specific mark of case assumed by a noun, when used absolutely as the nominative to a sentence. The government, in the first instance, is termed *verbal*, because the change of termination is occasioned by some word either expressed or understood; in the second it is called *absolute*, because the word thus governed is considered independent of all verbal agency, and acquires this peculiar form of construction from its nominative situation alone. Verbal government he then sub-divides into two distinct classes: the first comprehends *ninety-one* specific words, which are termed from their nature *prescriptive* governors; the second contains *seven* distinct classes of words, such as verbs, adjectives, participles, infinitives, &c. &c., each of which necessarily includes all the words of its own species; and each of these classes he considers numerically as *one*, and terms the whole *analogous* governors: here, then, are all the verbal governors in the language reduced to ninety-eight: viz. *ninety-one* in the prescriptive, and *seven* in the analogous class; to which, if we add two in the absolute, we shall have an exact centenary of governing powers."

Among these, as we learn from page 1, some are termed by the grammarians of Arabia *لظي* or *verbal*, and some *معنوي* or *absolute*; of the verbals, one class is styled *سماعي* or the *prescriptive government*; and another *قياسي* or the *analogous*. Our author then proceeds to the class of *seventeen* particles, which govern the noun alone in the genitive or relative case: these are—

! Vide Voss. de Natura Artium. The work is also attributed to Hermes

با—من—عن—الي—في—لام—رب—علي—كان—مذ—مند—
حتي—واو القسم—تاء القسم—حاشا—خلا—عدا

and he illustrates their powers by such short examples as the following—

مررت بزيد I went *near*, and *passed* Zeid—
سرت من البصرة الي الكوفة I travelled *from* Bassorah *to*
Koofa—

رمىت السهم عن القوس I shot the arrow *from* the
bow, &c.

But those who wish to become masters of the abstruse Arabic Syntax, with all its niceties, must peruse attentively the *Miut Amil* itself, which, in the volume before us, occupies but five pages of original text, and sixteen of the translation; he must also study the *Shurhoo Miut Amil*, شرح مائة عامل—or “Commentary on the Hundred Governing Powers,” of which the Arabic text occupies thirty-one pages, and the English version two hundred and sixteen, being enriched with the learned translator's copious annotations, and a variety of Tales and Anecdotes, each exhibiting some certain particle under all the senses ascribed to it in the commentary. From these, without any reference to the particular word illustrated, we shall extract the following حكايت or story.

“A certain city loungee was standing one day in the street, and happened to see a woman of elegant appearance pass by with a child in her arms. He said to the people about him—‘If any one will bring me that child, in order that I may kiss his feet, I will give him ten dirhums’—but nobody answered him. He addressed them again, and said, ‘I will give fifteen dirhums to any one that will bring me the child;’ but they continued silent as before. ‘I had better,’ said he to himself, ‘leave these blockheads alone, and watch the motions of the woman, and wherever she goes, go there also; and at whatever house she enters, stop there, and wait her coming out;’ upon which he began to follow her. The woman turned round, and said, ‘What is your object, sir, in pursuing me thus?’ ‘I wish’ (replied he) ‘for permission to kiss the feet of that child; and if you allow me, I will do whatever you command.’ ‘Why do you wish this?’ said the woman. ‘Because I love you’ (replied he), ‘and you love the child, and the beloved of the beloved is also beloved.’ The woman laughed at his answer, and said, ‘If you are determined on this, you had better wait for his father, who is about to proceed to the bath; and when he takes off his shoes, you can go and kiss his feet, for my love to him is greater than to this child.’ The fellow was abashed at her reply, and retreated.” —P. 137.

We shall extract another Story from page 180. "The wife of a niggardly attorney happened to be seized with a longing after fish, and expressed her desire one day to her husband. 'O what execrable food' (said the attorney) 'is fish, and how vile a thing is fish for food! for its F is *fatality*, its I *insipidity*, its S *sickness*, and its H *horror*.' The good woman, however, was determined to satisfy her longing; and accordingly, having pawned her ear-ring, unknown to him, purchased some fish; but in the very act of enjoying it, who pops in upon her but old Pinchpenny, who, seeing her eating, cried out, 'What is that you are eating, my dear?' 'Nothing but a little fish' (replied the wife), which a neighbour woman has sent me.' 'Oh, ho' (cried Muckworm), 'then allow me to join your mess immediately, for most excellent food is fish, and fish is truly excellent for food; for its F is *fatness*, its I *impletion*, its S *salubrity*, and its H *hilarity*.' 'What a vile describer of fish you are' (said his wife); 'for yesterday you abused it, and now again you are praising it.' 'Nay, my dear' (said the attorney), 'I am an admirable definer of fish, for I divide it into two classes; one that is purchased with money, and this I hold to be the bad class; the other that is got gratuitously, and this I consider the good class.' His wife laughed at his answer, and was surprised at the readiness of his reply."

Our limits restrict us to one story more, which we shall borrow from page 230. "'I resided at Basrah' (said a certain Arabian Yorick) 'as a parson, and professor of humanity; and was, one day, a good deal amused by a strange fellow, squint-eyed, straddle-footed, lame of both legs, with rotten teeth, stammering tongue, staggering in his gait like a man intoxicated, puffing and blowing like a thirsty dog, and foaming at the mouth like an angry camel, who came up, and seated himself before me. 'Whence come you' (said I), 'O father of gladness?' 'From home, please your worship,' said he; 'And pray where is your home?' (I rejoined) 'and what is the cause of your journey?' 'My home' (he replied) 'is near the great mosque, adjoining the poor-house; and I am come for the purpose of being married, and to beg you will perform the ceremony: the object of my choice is this long-tongued, importunate, hump backed, scarlet-skinned, one-eyed, no-nosed, stinking, deaf, wide-mouthed daughter of my uncle.' 'Do you agree, Miss Long-tongue' (said I), 'to marry this Mr. Pot-belly?' 'Ay,' said the lady, with a great deal of Doric brevity. 'Then accept, my friend' (cried I), 'this woman for your wife—take her home, cherish, and protect her.' So he took her by the hand and departed. Now it happened, that about nine months after that, they both returned to me rejoicing; and had hardly seated themselves, when my old friend *Adonis* called out, 'O, your worship, we have been blessed with a most sweet and fascinating child; and are come to request you will bless and give him a name, and offer up a prayer for his parents.' Now what should I behold but

¹ Or, agreeably to the original word, *سوم*, its first letter is *poison*, its second *sickness*, and its third *affliction*; and again, its first is *fatness*, its second *enjoyment*, and its third *competency*.

a little urchin, stone-blind, hare-lipped, without the use of its hands, splay-footed, bald-headed, ass-eared, bull-necked, not possessing one sense out of the five, and altogether frightful and deformed : in short, a perfect epitome of all the qualities of his parents. At this sight, I said to them, 'Be thankful for this darling boy, and call him *Oombror*,¹ for truly he has all your perfections combined in himself, and that child is truly admirable who resembles his parents.'

In the Annotations (page 103) Captain Lockett notices a species of paronymous composition, very frequent among the Arabs and Persians, and occasionally practised by the Greek and Latin Poets. Numerous examples of the Paronomasia are given, he observes, by Vossius, in his *Rhetoric*, and others may be found in Aulus Gellius, Plautus, Ennius, &c. The following Arabic couplet contains a delicate play on words, that cannot be preserved in a translation. Capt. L. quotes it in his remarks on لا, the common responsive negative, directly opposed to نعم "yes."

رايت ظمياً علي كئيبٍ بخجلِ البدر و الهلال

فقلت ما اسمك فقال لولو فقلت لي لي فقال لا لا

"I saw a fawn upon a billock, whose beauty eclipsed the full moon : I said, 'What is thy name?' She answered '*Deer*.' 'What, my *dear*?' said I ; but she replied, 'No ! no !'" Here the play on لولو *loo loo*, لي لي *lee lee*, and لا لا *la la*, is inevitably lost in translation. The first means *a pearl*, the second is a repetition of *mine* or *for me*, and the third a reduplication of the negative *no*.

But we must not exceed our limits ; and might, perhaps, close this article best by declaring generally, that the volume before us contains in every page something to instruct or entertain. We shall, however, more particularly direct our readers' attention to the learned translator's Preface, and his important Remarks on the term حدث (p. 195 and seq.) which are replete with curious and valuable criticism.

O.

NOTICE OF

Tiberius Rhetor de figuris, Altera Parte Auction ; una cum Rufi Arte Rhetorica. Edidit Jo. FR. BOISSONADE.
 Lond. in Æd. Valp. 1815. 8vo. pp. 98. Pr. 6s. 6d.

THIS little work is dedicated to Dav. Jac. Van Lennep, a celebrated Professor at Amsterdam. The circumstances, under which

¹ Literally, "*The joy of his parents*," being compounded of أم *mother*, أب *father*, and سرور *joy*.

this publication originated, and the manner in which the work has been executed, will be best explained in the very learned and ingenious Editor's own words :

"Casu ad Tiberium fui delatus, nihilque unquam minus cogitavi, quam me hujus fore scriptoris editorem. In Codice Vaticano 489, quem aliud quærens evolvebam, inveni Tiberii Σχήματα : et, cum voluissem conferendo experiri num essent editis emendatiora, non sine quadam voluptate (nam non carent nostra studia voluptate) animam verti Tiberium manu scriptum duplo majorem esse quam editum. Tiberium et alteram partem, qua Figuræ Elocutionis exponit, Galeo defuisse, primo hujus libri editori, nec non Fischero qui Galeanam Editionem iteravit, indiligenter nimium et incuriose : etenim immania priorum typographorum peccata sapius repetere non dubitavit. Sed Tiberium integrum habere nihil erat, nisi et alii haberent. Ergo me ad editionem adieci ; at levi manu rem peregi : nam non est Tiberius is auctor, a cujus editore multum expectent lectores. Galeanas observationes servavi, et identidem Claudii Capperonnerii adposui notulas, a me descriptas ex margine exempli Oxoniensis, quod, post fata viri *ρητορικατατος*, in Bibliothecam Regiam Parisinam migravit. Hoc eodem exemplo usus est Schneiderus, atque inde sumisit quas dedit ad Demetrium Phalereum Capperonnerii emendationunculas. Præterea locorum a Tiberio excitatorum fontes quam potui diligentissime indicavi, varietatesque Codicum Vaticani et Parisini 2918 enotavi : e prioribus, cum maxima sedulitate ; e posteriore, qui altera parte caret, non nimis anxie : nam fere cum Galeana conspirare videbatur.

"Parem in Rufo edendo rationem tenui. Rufum dederat olim Tiberio comitem Galeus, sed anonymum. Scriptoris nomen comode obtulit idem ille Regius liber. Inventi nominis fortuna Rufo profuit. Quem anonymum adhuc latere sivilsem in Galei et Fischeri libellis, jam volui, recuperato nomine, publicæ notitiæ luce donare, et ipsi novus quasi pater existere. Meum enim movebat animum fatum illud triste quod ipsi nomen inviderat, et alteram, post mortem, mortem attulerat. Nec tamen paterni affectus justum esse me judicem impediunt, et quam sit tenuis meus ille Rufus optime intelligo.

"Hic finem præfandi faciam ; nam de Tiberio quæ scire forte cupis Testimonia a me collecta te docebunt. De Rufo autem, præter nomen, nihil novi."

The notes, with which the Editor has enriched the book, bear an honorable testimony to his learning, ingenuity, taste, judgment, and accuracy. Many of them are so excellent, that we shall easily obtain the pardon of our readers for thus occupying two or three of our pages.

Diotimi Epigr. ἀστραπηφόρος, ἀστραπηβόλος, ἀστραπηβόλειω.

"De » pro » in vocibus huic similibus, cf. quæ notavi ad Marin. p. 105. Perpetua est harum syllabarum, propter soni similitudinem, permutatio. Diotimi Epigramma quartum in primo versu laborat.

αἱ δ' Ἀρτεμιν αὐτὸς ὁ χαλκίους Μανύει. Non faciunt satis Brunckii et Jacobsonii conatus. Propono ἡ δ' Ἀρτεμιν—Anonymus qui editur in *Notitiis Manuscriptorum*, t. 6. p. 500. eodem modo vitiatum est: ἡν ἡξιώθη βασιλεῖν εισάπαν. Lege, ἡν ἡξιώθη βασ—Alia obiter in hujus auctoris carmine emendabo: at meam mihi in ignobilissimo poetastro corrigendo sedulitatem nemo exprobet; nam dignus est emendatione, qui fuit habitus editione dignus. Vers. 5. ὅχος αἰφύιον ὦν χρυσήλατον ξίνον. Editor doctissimus proponit ὅλος ταμίον—ego ὅλος ταμίον. Quam sæpe permutentur λ et χ docuit Bastius ad Gregorium. Sed ταμίον non mutandum; ταμίιον versum facit æquo longiorem. Metrum enim est iambicum politicum dodecasyllabum, cum accentu in penultima, non servato ubique iambo finali. Ab hac norma recedere videtur versus undecimus, desinens in ἰώσφορος: sed accentum male imposuit vel librarius, vel typotheta. Legendum ἰώσφορος.—v. 27. αὐτῷ θεῖσθαι χάριν ἀστραπηφόρον. Lego, αὐτοῦ. Voce ἀστραπηφόρος caret H. Stephani Thesaurus, qui nec habet epithetum ejusdem commatis, ἀστραπηβολός, inveniendum apud Eumathium vi. p. 197. nec verbum ἀστραπηβολέω. Eumathio iii. p. 70. pro ἐκ νεφών ἀστραβολῆι, restituo ἀστραπηβολῆι. * * * * * Auctori notæ melioris, Philoxeno Athenæi i. 8. nocet particula γη. Σκορπὸς αὐ παύσις γη, σοῦ τὸν πρωκτὸν ὑπελθών. Non dicitur quid vel quem scorpius sedaverit. Lego: Σκ. αὐ παύσις σι, σοῦ τ. π. ὕ. vel Σκ. αὐ παύσι γι σι, σοῦ τ. πρ. ὕ. Elmsleius, vir egregius, ad Acharn. Auct. p. 116. huic loco alia ratione mederi conatus est." p. 17, 18.

LYSIAS Epitaph. explained.

"Lysias Epitaph. p. 95. R. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν ἐνέκον τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ, Λακιδαιμόνιοι δὲ, οὐδὲν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐνδείξιν γινόμενοι. Supplementa hiatus proposuerunt docti interpretes, et Augerius, semper audacior, scripsit e conjectura Reiskii quem, de more, nominare neglexit, Λακιδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἰδυοσύχσαν. Equidem credo hic esse ἀποσιώπησιν, et scribendum Λακιδαιμόνιοι δὲ· οὐδὲν." p. 25.

PLUTARCH corrected.

"Sæpe notatum est quam frequenter αἰ et ι permutentur, et nuper a Letronnio, viro juvene a quo egregia speranda sunt, in Animadversionibus ad Dicuillum. Vide Porson. ad Odys. r. 278. Hæc observatio Plutarcho proderit de Aud. poet. p. 90. Krebs. καθάπερ ἐν νόθῳ φωτὶ καὶ κικραμένις μύθοις ἀληθείας. Wytttenbachius, quam opportune obtulerunt codices lectionem, κικραμένης recepit. Jam locus erit omnino restitutus, deletο καὶ, nato e prava iteratione initialis syllabæ vocis κικραμένης: 'in adulterina luce veritatis temperatæ fabulis.' Hic perfecti reduplicatio, κῑ, peperit ex se conjunctionem καὶ: alibi syllaba κῑ prorsus evanuit, mutata male in conjunctionem, verbi causa, καὶ χαρισμῖνος pro κικραρισμῖνος. Vide notam ad Marinum p. 98." p. 26.

Σαφήνεια, a rhetorical word.

In p. 30. Professor B. quotes the words of Mr. Blomfield in Gloss. ad Sept. Theb. "σαφήνεια, vox rarior," and adds that H. Stephens in the *Thes.* notices it as a word of rare occurrence in

prose. Mr. Bl. was in all probability led by H. Stephens to make the remark, which, however true it may be with respect to the historians, orators, and poets, is untrue in regard to the rhetorical writers. Boissonade well observes "rhetoribus placuit," and he appeals to Aristotle Poet. c. 37, to Theo Progymn. p. 31, 32. ed. Camer. to Aphthon. Progymn. p. 4. Commel., to Aristides T. II. p. 475, to Rufus s. 16, 17., Demetr. s. 202., Hermogenes de Form. II. 11, p. 489., to Matth. Camariota p. 10. 24. 25., to Apsines, and others. We had ourselves lately occasion to read a very considerable part of Hermogenes, and there we met with the word not only in the places referred to by Professor B., but in several other passages. It may be found often in Dionysius Halic. "Aristoteli σαφὲς λέξεις est, quæ medium tenet inter ἀδολεσχίαν et συντομίαν, loquacitatem et nimiam brevitatem Lib. III. *Rhet.* cap. 12. fin. Diog. Laert. X. 10. commemorat Epicuri λέξιν κυρίαν καὶ ιδιωτάτην, deinde addit: σαφὲς ἢν οὕτως, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἀξιοῖ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἢ σαφῆνειαν ἀπαιτεῖν." Ernesti Lex. Technol. Gr. *Rhet.* p. 305. Ernesti thus defines the word: "Σαφῆνεια, *claritas orationis*, prima ejus virtus ex disciplina Hermogenis Lib. I. περὶ ἰδ. p. 26. quæ constat duabus rebus, τῷ καθαροῦ et εὐκρινεῖ, puritate et perspicuitate."

PLUTARCH corrected.

"Plutarchus de Superstit. s. 16. p. 54. Matth. οὐδὲ δυνὸν ἐν καιρῷ ποδῶν σκιᾶς πρὸς σιλήνην ἀπαντησάσης. Sudant interpretes in explicando vel corrigendo ποδῶν, nec proficiunt hilum. Conjeci πάγων σκιᾶς quod verum esse omnino videtur. Locutio est poetica, quam potuit de more Plutarchus a poeta quodam mutuari, Æschylo forte, vel Pindaro. Πάγων σκιᾶς est conus umbræ. Vide Albertium ad Hesychii Πάγων." p. 36.

We entirely agree with the Professor in the propriety of this conjecture.

Æschylus *Agam.* v. 314. φλογὺς μέγαν πάγωνα. Stanley translates the words thus, *promissam ignis barbam*. Schol. A. Πάγωνα λέγει τὴν εἰς ὀξύ λήγουσαν ἀκμὴν τοῦ πυρός· καὶ ὁ πάγων γὰρ εἰς ὀξύ λήγει ὥσπερ καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ Αὐθάδη γνάθον τὴν ἀκμὴν εἴρηκε, καὶ ὀξύτητα τῆς σφηνός (*Prom. Vinct.* 64.) σημειῶσαι δὲ ὅτι ἐκ τούτου ἀνωμάσθη παρὰ τοῖς μετεωρολόγοις παγωνίας ἀστήρ. "Iisdem verbis," says Stanley, "rationem præbet Scholiastes Homeri antiquus, quare πάγων, Latinis *Pogonus*, Træzeniorum portus appellatus fuerit, πάγων δὲ, inquit, ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ πάγωνος, διότι λήγει εἰς ὀξύ. Porro ad hujus loci nomen alluisse videri Æschylum putat vir cl. in Pompon. Mel. ii. 3. *Tanquam si a face Agamemnonia esset appellatus*. Hunc Æschyli locum respexit Jul. Pollux *Onomast.* II. 4. ἐν τῇ τραγωδίᾳ, Πάγων πυρὸς, ἢ εἰς ὀξύ ἀναδρομὴ τῆς φλογός." "*Pogonias* vocant," says Pliny, "quibus inferiore ex parte

in speciem barbæ longæ promittitur juba," Lib. II. 25. Manilius Lib. I. v. 837.

Et globus ardentis sequitur sub imagine barbæ.

We may observe that the astronomical use of the word as applied to *comets with their fiery tails* may have suggested to Plutarch, when speaking, as he appears to do, astronomically, the use of it in the passage under consideration.

Carcini nomen in Catalogo Rhetorum.

"Alexander Rhet. ii. 2. de anadiplosi : τούτο τὸ σχῆμα ὁ μὲν Καρκίνος παλλογίαν καλῷ. Normannus pro Καρκίνος, reponi volebat Καικίλιος. Vides iterum nomen Cæcili depravatum ; nam nullus dubito quin vera sit Normanni emendatio, delendumque Carcini nomen in Catalogo Rhetorum Fabriciano." p. 44.

ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι, *proverbially used.*

In p. 45 we have the phrase ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι, numbered among the instances of the figure "epanalepsis." The Professor says in the note : "Hæc forte petita e Tragico. Apostolius XXI. 9. ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι, ἐπὶ τῶν δυστυχούντων. Pantinus reponendum arbitratur, ὦ γάμοι ἄγαμοι. Facile quis videt Pantinum errare." We are surprised that the real source of the phrase ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι, which Apostolius numbers among his proverbs, should not have occurred to a memory so exact, and ready, and rich as that of the Professor on most occasions.

ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι
ἐφύσταθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ φυτεύσασαιτες, πάλιν
ἀνείτε τὰντων σπέρμα, κλπεδεῖξατε
πατέρας, ἀνελφούς, παιδας, αἰμ' ἐμφύλιον,
νύμφας, γυναικας, μητερας τε, χῶπούα
αἰσχιστ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐργα γίγνεται.

Sophocles Œd. T. v. 1403. ex ed. Elms.

The Professor will recollect the notice taken of the passage by the Pseudo-Longinus π. v. sect. 23. The proverb cannot trace its origin higher than Sophocles.

ÆSCHINES corrected : ἐπίσταμαι, γιγνώσκω.

"Πλειστάζει Æschines in Timarch. p. 44. R. ἐπιτάδαν . . . τοὺς νόμους γνῶ καὶ εἶδῃ. Sed Codex Coislinianus vocibus γνῶ καὶ caret, hocque adjectum habet scholium : εἶδῃ περισποιμῖνας ἀναγνωστῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰὼν γνῶ καὶ μάθῃ. Crediderim Æschinem scripsisse tantum νόμους εἶδῃ, et e scholio marginali γνῶ καὶ irrepsisse." p. 55.

Though we are disposed to think with Mr. B. that γνῶ καὶ is a marginal gloss, yet we are afraid to speak positively, and respectfully submit to the consideration of this truly enlightened Parisian the following instance of pleonasm, which seems in a great measure to vindicate the propriety of γνῶ καὶ in the passage of Æschines:

τὰ χρηστ' ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γινώσκμεν,

Eurip. Hippol. v. 382.

θυσιάς ἐπιττάμεσθα καὶ γινώσκμεν.

Eurip. Iphig. Taur. p. 490.

On this second passage J. Markland judiciously writes thus : "*Novimus et scimus* : τῆς ταυτότητος suspicionem levio-rem fore putaverit forte aliquis, si legatur, καὶ εὖ γινώσκμεν. *et probe cognita habemus*. Sed reclamant ipse Euripides Hipp. 380. et D. Lucas Act. Apost. xix. 15. [τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω, καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι] Plautus Mil. Glor. II. 5. 42. *Neque vos, qui homines sitis, novi, neque scio*." But to the passage produced from the Acts it may be well objected that the two verbs are introduced, where one might have been sufficient, merely for the sake of variety, and do not in this instance bear the same appearance of pleonasm, which is visible in the passages of Æschines, Euripides, and Plautus ; and therefore we subjoin the following example : Marc. xiv. 68. οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδ' ἐπίσταμαι, τί σὺ λέγεις.

ATHENÆUS corrected.

"Non abs re erit Anaxandridem Athenæi l. 62. ἀσυνδίτην liberare, quod in ejus versus inopportune invexerunt librarii : ἰὰν λούσησθε νῦν, ῥά-φανόν τε πολλὴν ἐντράγῃ, παύσῃτε τὸ βάρος, διασκιδᾷτε τὸ πρὸς ἡμῶν ἱερὸν ; Ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου. Quis non offendet ad παύσῃτε, διασκιδᾷτε ? Lego : ῥάφανον τε πολλὴν ἐντράγῃ, ἔπαυσέ τε τὸ βάρος, διασκιδᾷτε τὸ πρ.—Ἐπαυσε, ῥάφανος nempe.—Vel mutaverim tantum διασκιδᾷτε in διασκιδᾷτε, nempe ῥάφανος." p. 60.

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS corrected.

"Morbo Paterculus laborare videtur ii. 7.—'Factum Opimii, quod inimicitiarum quæsitæ erat ultio, minor sequuta auctoritas : et visa ultio privato odio magis quam publicæ vindictæ data.' Ingrata vocis ultio repetitio merito displicuit doctis interpretibus ; sed locum non feliciter tentaverunt. Equidem, nescio an felicius, conjicio ultio post visa esse glossema, delendumque. Glossator metuebat ne quis visa referret ad auctoritas, et adposito ultio, errori cavebat ; sed ipsa sedulitas auctori nocuit, et glossema textum invasit." p. 62.

DEMOSTHENES De Cor.

In p. 64. Tiberius, quoting the celebrated passage of Demosthenes, has, Ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦεν, whereas in the editions of Demosthenes we have ἦ. This variation has escaped the notice of Professor B.

εἰλήχσαν, πεποιήκεσαν, etc.

"Theodorus p. 88. f. πρὸς γὰρ μὴν τὰς νότους : et p. 86. τῶς γε μὴν οἱ βὺν εἰλήχσαν κολοβόν. Ad vocem εἰλήχσαν adpictum sic, dubitationem editoris celeberrimi indicare videtur. Sed in hoc scriptore talis forma ferenda est. Etenim tunc temporis tertia plurali plusquam perfecti

Attici persona utebantur, loco perfecti vel aoristi. Tzetzes initio commentarii in Iliadem habet ἐπικειχρήκισαν, πιφροντίκισαν, πιποιήκισαν, non alio modo posita." p. 67, 68.

Curious Latin Inscription.

In p. 69. M. B. quotes from the "Auctores Itineris literarii duorum Monachorum D. Benedicti" T. I. p. 301. an Inscription, which deserves a place in our Miscellany :

HOSPES, QUID SIM, VIDES.

QUID FUËRIM, NOSTI.

FUTURUS IPSE QUID SIS, COGITA."

DEMOSTHENES corrected.

"Exord. Olynth. I. Ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἂν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἐλίσθαι νομίζω, εἰ φανερόν γένοιτο τὸ μέλλον συνοίσιν τῇ πόλει. Sic vulgo distinguunt. Sed Dupinus, vir doctissimus, qui nuper Oratoris Olynthiacas fecit gallicas, commate posito post γένοιτο, non εἰ φανερόν γένοιτο, sed τὸ μέλλον συνοίσιν a verbo ἐλίσθαι pendere notavit : quæ sententia omnino vera esse videtur, et commode firmari a Rufo, qui συμφέρον καὶ χρήματα συγκρίνεσθαι animadvertit, non χρήματα et τὸ φανερόν. Demosthenes qui hic ἐλίσθαι τὸ μέλλον συνοίσιν scribit, paucis interjectis dicet ραδίαν τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος αἴρεσιν γινέσθαι : et hoc Dupinianam interpretationem tuetur." p. 78, 79.

οἰκισκος, domus avium.

In p. 89. of Rufus the famous words of Demosthenes occur, καὶ ἐν οἰκίσκῳ τις αὐτὸν καθείρξας τηρεῖ. We embrace this opportunity of telling our readers that the word οἰκισκος, in the sense usually assigned to it in this place, occurs in the "Geoponics," as edited by Niclas, that οἶκος is there so used more than once, and that *domus* is so used by Lucretius at the opening of the first book :
"Frondiferasque domos avium, camposque virentes."

ON THE WORD PALIMPESTUS.

"IT is well known" (says a Reviewer of a Volume of *Fragments of Cicero*, lately printed at Milan) "that we have to ascribe the loss of many valuable works to a practice, which prevailed in the middle ages amongst the monkish scribes, who used to pare off the surface of parchment manuscripts, or to obliterate the ink by some chemical process, for the purpose of fitting them to receive the works of some Christian author. Copies of books thus prepared and written on a second time are called *Codices Palimpsesti*. It appears, from the account given by Wetstein of the *Codex Claromontanus* of the New Testament, that it had originally contained the works of some tragedian, perhaps Sophocles. A very ancient Galen was detected under the text of the New Testament by Knittel, in the library at Wol-

fenbutter: for the erasure (*eracement*, Johnson) of the original writing was not always so complete, but that parts of it might be deciphered by holding it up to the light."

In a note on the word *Palimpsesti*, after quoting the two passages from Cicero and Catullus, referred to by Stephens, Gesner, Ainsworth, Cooper, Adams, and every other Latin or Greek Lexicographer, under the word *palimpsestus* or *παλίμψηστος*, he proceeds; "In both which passages some read *palinæsto*. Gloss. Vett. *Παλίμψηστρον Delecticia*. Another has *Delecticia Παλίμψηστρον*. To say the truth, I do not see by what analogy *παλίμψηστος* is formed. It should rather be *παλίμψητος*."

I will show him by what analogy; and will give at full length in *gratiam lectoris* what is said on the subject by H. Stephens, under the word *ψάω*; from whence by an easy process we come at *ψηστός*.

Ψηστός, οὗ, ὁ. *Tersus*, *Detersus*: vel *Rasus*, *Derasus*, aut *Radendo detersus*. UNDE *παλίμψηστος*, ου, ὁ καὶ ἡ, *iterum Derasus*, vel *Deradendo tersus*. Pro quo ET *παλίψηστος* scriptum reperitur, onmisso μ. Dicunturque tabellæ vel chartæ aut membranæ *παλίμψηστοι* sive *παλίψηστοι*, quæ secundo rasæ et detersæ sunt: ut deleta prior scriptura, nova possit inarari; quas Latini *deletitias chartas* et *membranas* vocant, opposcentes ei novam. Ut quum Ulpianus ait, *chartæ appellatio et ad novam chartam refertur et ad deletitiam*. Plut. in fine libelli quem conscripsit περὶ τοῦ ὅτι μάλιστα τοῖς ἡγεμόσι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον διαλέγεσθαι, de Platone loquens in Siciliam ad erudiendum Dionysium profecto, εἶπε Διονύσιον ὥσπερ βιβλίον παλίψηστον ἤδη μολυσμῶν ἀνάπλεων, καὶ τὴν βαφὴν οὐκ ἀνιέντα τῆς τυραννίδος, ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ δευσοποιὸν οὔσαν. Idem in lib. περὶ ἀδολεσχείας, non ita procul ab initio, οἱ δὲ ἀποκναίουσιν δῆπον τὰ ὥτα ταῖς ταυτολογίαις, ὥσπερ παλίψηστα διαμολύνοντες. Latini etiam *palimpsesti* voce utuntur, ut Cic. ad Trebat. lib. 7. Epist. 18. "Nam quod in *palimpsesto*, (s. *literas dedens*) laudo equidem parsimoniam: sed miror quid in illa chartula fuerit quod delere malueris, nisi forte tuas formulas; non enim puto te meas epistolas delere ut reponas tuas. An hoc significas, nihil fieri, frigere te, ne chartam quidem tibi suppeditare!" Ubi satis apertè ostendit, *palimpsesti* nomine se accipere chartam *deletitiam*: hoc est, in qua, deleta prior scriptura, reponitur alia: Sic Catullus epigr. 19. (20) ad Varum de Suffeno quodam, "Idemque longè plurimos facit versus. Puto esse ego illi millia aut decem, aut plura Perscripta; nec sit, ut fit, in *palimpsesto* Relata: chartæ regiæ, novi libri, Novi umbilici, lora rubra, membrana Directa plumbo, et pumice omnia æquata." Sed notandum est, in posteriore Plutarchi loco veterem codicem pro *παλίψηστα* HABERE *παλίμψαιστα*, a *ψάω*; apud Catullum, quibusdam in exemplaribus legi *palinæyto*, seu *palinæsto*, ut quidam scribere malunt. Sunt porro duo illa COMF. *Παλίγχεστος* ET *Παλίγχεστος*, ex verbis *ξέω* et *ξύω*, idem cum *ψάω* significantibus, nimirum *Rado*, *Erado*, *Derado*: sonatque *παλίγχεστος* sive *παλίγχεστος* *Iterum rasus*, *Derasus*, *Rasus* et *pumice æquatus*. nam *ξύειν* et *ψᾶν* ita significant *radere* seu *eradere*, ut simul τοῦ ὁμαλίζειν et æquandi seu complanandi habeant significationem aliquam, et præsertim si tabellam

scriptorium ψῆν sive ξέειν dicamur. Budæus SCRIBIT Παλιγγεστός, ut et Παλιγγεστός alii."

So wretched a Greek scholar was Robert Ainsworth that he actually proceeds to derive the word from πάλιν and ξέω.

1815.

A. F.

P. S. Mr. Elmsley in his notes on the *Medea* (v. 842.) has the following passage. "Multum ad nostrum locum illustrandum valet Phœnissarum locus a nemine, quod sciam, huc relatus. v. 838. τᾷς Ἀφροδίτας τε λῦρας ὑπο πύργος ἀνέστα διδύμων ποταμῶν, &c. Majori quidem jure Thebæ διδύμων ποταμῶν πύργος (i. e. πόλις) appellantur, quæ Athenæ ἱερῶν ποταμῶν πόλις propter parvum flumen Cephisum [nothing said about the Ilissus], quod modo memoravit noster. Sed poetarum proprium est res exiguas dicendo amplificare." If Mr. E. will turn to p. 166. of our xth Vol. he will there find something on the subject.

CAMBRIDGE PRIZE POEM

FOR 1790.

ODE LATINA

NUMISMATE ANNUO DIGNATA

ET IN CURIA CANTABRIGIENSI RECITATA.

MARE LIBERUM.

Sic, quando vastum funditur in mare,
 Parvas et intermiscet aquas salo
 Rivus, profundo vix inausciti
 Percipitur pelagi barathro;
 Ut Musa nisu præcipiti mea
 Fertur, pusillum flumen et ingenî
 Sinu in capaci, liberique
 Laudibus Oceani recondit.
 Quin æstuosum ne metuas mare,
 Pimplea; inox et fontibus integris
 Gaudebis, et dulci Hippocrene,¹ aut
 Castaliis potieris undis.
 Felix, amicæ qui monitis piè
 Fretus Minervæ, roboream ratem
 Construxit, effusoque primus
 Non timuit dare velâ ponto.

10

¹ Metrum laborat. Penultima hujus vocis ubique legitur producta. Dixit Strabo, si bene memini, Ἰππωκρήνη. Ἡ κρήνη τοῦ Ἰππου (Dor. Ἰπτω) sciñcet. Quia et Hesiodus habet Ἰππουκρήνη.

Ille et marini regna Dei nova
 Mortalibus subjecit, et æquoris
 Ærarium reclusit ingens,
 Auctor opum decorisque nostri. 20
 Videsne rivos Hermus ut aureos
 Fundit, politumque India ebur, sua
 Molles Sabæi thura mittunt,
 Balsamaque, et croceos odores?
 Cydoniorum intendimus arcum
 Subtile robur; Threiciis equis
 Insidimus, Phœniciique
 Regio honore nitemus ostri.
 Læti exterarum fructibus arborum
 Carptis ab umbrâ vescimur; optimum 30
 Uvæ liquorem Formianæ aut
 Nectareum bibimus Falernum.
 Quin et feraci terra sinu capit
 Fovetque longinquæ genitalia
 Sementa Methymnæ; recenti
 Induitur foliorum amictu,
 Et poma mirans non sua, Lesbicis
 Rubet racemis fraxinus insito
 Ut gaudet efflorere malo, et
 In platano pyra lacta canent. 40
 Quid quas opertis in penetralibus
 Alit perennes divitias mare,
 Fœtuque Neptunum natantem
 Innumero referam tumentem?
 Quid vasta quanto corpore se movent
 Cete? revulsum credideris procul
 Montem avehi, radicibusve
 Ortygiam freta ferre ruptis.
 Quid delicatos Carpathii canam
 Scari saporis? aut acipenserem 50
 Laudatum, et extensi decorem
 Egregium spatiumque rhombi?
 Quas ergo largâ fudit opes manu
 Omnes per undas Oceanus pater,
 Mæotis æquæ vel remoti
 Divitiis potiantur Indi.
 Nec tu solutum marmoreis iter,
 Hispanæ, campis obstrue, non tua
 Regna arrogans, circumfluque
 Publica jura maris coercens: 60

Victricibus firmata Britannia
 Si vellet armis,—sed modo vindicas
 Justos honores, liberique
 Afferit imperium profundi.

THOMAS G. TAYLOR,
 Coll. SS. et Indiv. Trin. A. S. 1790.

ON THE PROSODY OF GREEK VERSE

AS CONNECTED WITH DIALECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

THERE is a nice point in the Prosody of Greek verse as connected with dialect, to which I beg leave to call the attention of your critical readers.

In an *Essay on the Composition of the Greek Sapphic Ode* (*Class. Journ. No. IX. p. 123.*) it is doubted whether these words,

φαίνεται κείνῳ ἰσοκλήρος ἔμμεν,

can be considered as forming a legitimate line; when the fifth syllable is a long vowel *ad finem vocis*, supported by the *ictus*, but followed by an initial vowel in the next word. (Vide also *Class. Journ. No. XIII. p. 163.*)

The writer proceeds with greater positiveness in his next remark, thus:

“Of some other cases far more common in modern Sapphics, there is neither doubt nor difficulty; where, for instance, in the Trochaic movement, a long vowel or diphthong with an hiatus forms a short syllable.

“The following lines, therefore,

P. 103. καὶ Σθένος τοι μακρὰ βιβάν, καὶ οὔρῳ

P. 116. δεσμῶ ἔμπλεξεν κρατερῶ πλανάτας

and all other verses like these, Quintilius would bid you at once *incudi reddere*.

“The error lies in arguing or in seeming to argue from what obtains in dactylic to what is lawful in trochaic movement.

Iliad. Δ. 88. Πάνδαρον ἀντίθεον διζήμενήν, εἴπου ἐφύροι
 evidently affords no justification for a Sapphic line ending thus,
 ——— εἴπου εὔροι:

nor *Γ. 450.* Εἴπου ἰσαθρήσειεν Ἀλέξανδρον θεοσιδία
 for one thus beginning: “Ὅς καὶ αἰχματᾶν ταμίας κεραυνῶν.”

Mr. Blomfield, on the other hand, in the *Museum Criticum*; No. I. p. 6. has edited the fourth stanza of the ode of Sappho εἰς Ἀφροδίταν, in the following manner:

αἶψα δ' ἐκσίχοντο· τὸ δ', ὦ μάκαιρα,
 μειδιάσας ἀθανάτω προσώπων
 ἦρεν ὅττι τ' ἦν, τὸ πέπονθα, καὶ ττι
 δὴ τὲ κάλημι, ———

15

and with the following note on v. 15.

“ ἦρε’, omnes, quod Ionicum est.”

If the change of text thus settled by Mr. Blomfield be received as correct, the two verses quoted above from the *Musa Ca. *q-brigienses*, pp. 108, 116. become instantly legitimate.

First of all, however, *melior conditio possidentis* holds good in the critical court as well as in the judicial.

And secondly, in what sense is ἦρεο Ionic, in which it is not Æolic also, at least as having free ingress into the Æolic verse of Sappho and Pindar? In *πυλίων* and *πηληϊάδεω*, *πυλάων* and *Ἀτρεῖ-δαο*, we immediately recognise Ionic as distinguished from Æolic forms of the noun. But is it equally clear, that, as forms of the verb, ἦρεο ever stood in that relation to ἦρεν?

Lastly, perhaps, Mr. Blomfield, with all that vigilant acuteness for which we so justly admire him, was yet not aware, that if ἦρεο may be questioned on the score of dialect, ἦρεν so posited is at least as questionable on the score of metre.

I should apologise certainly for the minuteness of this discussion, were it not entwined with a subject of great annual interest to the young men of our University. When the Æolian lyre is awakened, the least tack, which fastens one of the strings, has its share of importance.

SIDNEYENSIS.

7th August, 1815.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. VII.

A Dictionary of Abbreviations would often prevent some strange mistakes. The following exhibits one of a curious nature. The words *Juliani cum Ægyptiis V. mil.* were, by the ignorance of a copyist, written at large, *Juliani cum Ægyptiis quinque milibus*. Thus the expression passed current, until a correct inquirer found that *mil.* was the abbreviation for *militibus*.¹

¹ We beg leave to refer our Correspondent to pp. 262 and 263 of Vol. VII. of the *Classical Journal*, where he will find the different abbreviations of *mille* and *miles*.—ED.

A more modern blunder may be here introduced. An officer, who wrote an account of an expedition against Tippoo Saib, gave his MS. to an eminent writer to polish into a style of greater elegance. The original had stated that a sickly regiment landed at Joanna, and received so much benefit from the air and vegetables of the island, that all had recovered except 2 or 3. In these numbers the *r* was so indistinct that it was overlooked, and the printed copy gravely informed the reader, that such was the salutary influence of the air and vegetables of the island, that all recovered except two hundred and three.

T. M.

OLYMPIC GAMES.—A MS. of Lucian, No. 2954, in the Royal Library in Paris, contains the following Scholium on the *Ῥητόρων Διδάσκαλος*, c. 9. which fixes the date of the suppression of the Olympic Games:

Πόλις ἦν ἐν Ἡλίδι Ὀλυμπία καλουμένη, ἱερὸν ἔχουσα ἐπιφανέστατον Ὀλυμπίου Διός. Ἐν ταύτῃ ἀγὼν ἐπετελεῖτο παγκόσμιος, τὰ Ὀλύμπια, κατὰ πέντε ἔτη συγκροτούμενος διὸ καὶ πενταετηρικὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὃς καὶ ἀνεγράφετο τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀεὶ, εἰς δῆλωσιν τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν, καὶ ἦν τοῦτο ἀκριβὲς τοῦ χρόνου ἐπίγνωσις, τεσσάρων γὰρ ἔτων μεταξὺ διαίροντων, τῷ πέμπτῳ συνετελεῖτο. Καὶ διήρκεσεν ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν Κριτῶν μεχρὶ τοῦ μικροῦ Θεοδώσου ἐμπρησθέντος γὰρ τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ναοῦ, ἐξέλιπε καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἡλείων πανήγυρις.

Latin Translation of SUIDAS.

Charles Stephens tells us, that the first Latin version of the *Lexicon*, which goes by the appellation of *Suidas*, was executed by Robert Grossetest, alias *Grosthead*; and, in the Latin form, *Capito*. This man was formerly Bishop of Lincoln, and died A. D. 1253.

Portus says nothing of this translation; nor Kuster, unless I am much mistaken, although I have him not by me.

If any of your correspondents can give information whether or not that work was ever printed, and, if not, whether there are any MSS. remaining of it, he shall be entitled to the thanks of

1815.

A. F.

Pontanus having made the following enigma on a *hole*,

Dic mihi quod majus fiat quo plura demas,

riverius answered,

Pontano demas carmina, major erit.

Latin Verses supposed to have been written by Bishop Pearson.

JUSTA
EDOVARDO KING

naufrago,

ab

Amicis mœrentibus,

amoris

et

μνείας χάριν.¹
* * * * *

CANTABRIGIÆ.—1638.

P. 14. TUTA peregrinis sospesque virescit ab armis,
Nec timet externam terra Britannia manum;
Ambitus aequorei quippe irremeabilis alvei
Difficiles aditus ambiguosque dedit:
Dum brevia, et Syrtes, medioque latentia ponto
Terrent ignotas naufraga saxa rates.
Diis maris hoc, summae quibus est hæc insula curae,
Indulgent nostro praesidium imperio.
Heu! tamen his periit queis nos servamur in undis,
Gloria Cantabrigi non reparanda chori.
Mitte male impensas posthac persolvere grates
Numinibus duris, terra Britannia, maris.
Non hoc praesidium, non sunt ea munera tanti,
Nec placet hac nobis conditione Salus.

JO. PEARSON.*

¹ Milton's *Lycidas* * first appeared in this collection; it is the last poem of the second part, which is entitled

"Obsequies to
the memorie
of
Mr. EDWARD
KING,
Anno Dom.
1638.
• • • • •

² "Joseph Pearson,"—T. Warton; on what authority W. has not stated. He informs us, that "the contributors were not all of Christ's College;" J. Pearson was at that time Fellow of King's College, and was collated by Bp. Davenant to the Prebend of Netherhaven, in the church of Sarum, in 1639.

* I have put down those variations which have not been noticed by T. Warton in his second edition of Milton's occasional poems. It is to be regretted that the editors have not adhered more faithfully to the orthography of our great Bard; it should not be wholly abandoned. With this, however, I have no concern.

1. inore; 2. never-sere; 4. rude; 10. He *well* knew—in the margin of the copy, which appears from v. 157. to have been collated with subsequent editions; 27. a-field; 42. hasil-copses; 51. Lord L. lov'd—in the margin; 66. stridly; 191. smites; 175. oazie—~~oazie~~ in margin; 177, in the margin.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS explained.

"Ammianus Marcellinus informs us of an observation, which Hornisdas, a Prince of Persia, made on Rome, and which is something remarkable, namely, *That one thing only had there pleased him—to find that men died at Rome as well as elsewhere.*

"Mr. Gibbon, in his History, has told us to read *displacuisse* for *placuisse*, 'displeased' for 'pleased'—a correction, to which those of Bentley are innocent. He says, the contrary sense would be that of a misanthrope, whereas his affords a reproof of Roman vanity.

"The sense that strikes me is very different from either of these, and is this, *that the Prince's envy at the pleasures of the inhabitants of Rome could only be moderated by the reflection that their pleasures were transitory.*

"How would the miserable envy the happy, were not the grave the equal termination of pleasure and of pain."—R. Heron's *Lectures of Literature*, Lond. 1785, 8vo. p. 68.

3. Καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς. Τίς ἀποκυλλοῖ ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου ;

4. Καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι, θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.—St. Mark's Gospel, chap. xvi.

3. "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

4. "(And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away,) for it was very great."

I am disposed to believe that the latter part of the fourth verse (ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα) ought to have been placed at the end of the third, for the following reasons:—

1st. Because the greatness of the stone was the occasion of the question, "Who shall roll us away the stone?"

2ndly. Because the connective particle γὰρ now stands perfectly useless, but with the alteration proposed, it will have a reference to the preceding question.

3rdly. Because the common English version tacitly acknowledges the propriety of my emendation, in an endeavour, by a most awkward parenthesis, to connect the words, which have been hitherto separated, with their proper subject.

The Translation may then be read thus :

3. "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? for it was very great.

4. "And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away ;

5. "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw," &c.

'Ακούσας ὁ Σεύθης τὴν φωνήν, ἤρώτα τὸν οἰνοχόον τί λέγοι. 'Ο δὲ οἰνοχόος εἶπεν 'Ἑλληνίζειν γὰρ ἠπίστατο. 'Ενταῦθα μὲν ἦδη γέλως ἐγένετο.—Xenophon's Anabasis, Book VIIth. Hutchinson's Ed. 4to. p. 550.

"When Seuthes heard him speak, he asked the cup-bearer what he said, who told him, for he could speak Greek: upon this there was a great laughing."—Spelman's Translation.

In my opinion, the passage ought to stand thus:

'Ακούσας ὁ Σεύθης τὴν φωνήν, ἤρώτα τὸν οἰνοχόον τί λέγοι ἑλληνίζειν γὰρ ἠπίστατο. 'Ο δὲ οἰνοχόος εἶπεν 'Ενταῦθα μὲν ἦδη γέλως ἐγένετο.

1st. Because the real sense seems to require it; for it is more natural to suppose that Seuthes, knowing that his cup-bearer understood Greek, should ask him what was said, which occasioned the mirth; than that Seuthes, without knowing whether his cup-bearer understood Greek or not, should accidentally apply to him, and that he, by good luck, should understand Greek.

2ndly. Because the word οἰνοχόος so immediately follows οἰνοχόον, that any pronoun or relative would have sufficiently answered the purpose, instead of a repetition of the same word.

Translation.

"When Seuthes heard him speak, he asked the cup-bearer what he said; for he understood Greek: the cup-bearer then told him; upon this, there was immediately a great laughing." J. W.

EURIPIDES *Emendatus*.

In Eurip. Orest. 606. voces δοῦναι δίκην reddit Porsonus *jus dare vel reddere, usu, ait ille, rarissimo; totumque locum sic distinguit. Μολῶν γὰρ εἰς ἑκκλητον 'Αργείων ὄχλον, 'Εκοῦσαν, οὐκ ἄκουσαν ἐπισείσω πόλιν, Σοὶ σὴ τ' ἀδελφῇ λεύσιμον δοῦναι δίκην. Ut amoveatur id quod, apud bonæ notæ Scriptores, pænè nuncupaveram solœcismum, ad hunc potius modum distinxerim. Μολῶν γὰρ εἰς ἑκκλητον 'Αργείων ὄχλον, 'Εκοῦσαν, οὐκ ἄκουσαν, ἐπισείσω πόλιν Σοὶ σὴ τ' ἀδελφῇ, λεύσιμον δοῦναι δίκην. Quin et sic verterim; Ubi enim perveritum sit ad convocatam Argivorum turbam, Volentem, minimè invitam, urbem commovebo In te tuamque sororem, ita ut pœnam pendatis lapidatione. Exemplum verbi ἐπισείω cum dativo, ut dicunt grammatici, personæ suppedabit ejusdem fabulæ, v. 249. 'Ω μητὲρ, ἰκετεύω σε, μὴ 'πίσειέ μοι Τὰς αἵματ' αὐτοὺς καὶ δρακοντῶδεις κόρας. Alexis Comicus apud Athenæum VIII. p. 339. citante Porsono. 'Ω μητὲρ, ἰκετεύω σε, μὴ 'πίσειέ μοι Τὸν Μισγόλαν. Ceterum haudquaquam aliter intellexit Scholiasta; cujus verba sunt bene interpretem agentis, κατὰ σοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς, ὥστε δοῦναι ὑμᾶς δίκην διὰ λίθων.*

On the translation of the Iliad into French, by Madame Dacier, whose name was Le Fevre :

Ἰλιάδ' ἡ Φαβερὴ Κελτοῖσιν ἔδωκεν' ἀληθὲς
Nūn Πηληϊάδεω μῆνιν ἄεισε Θεά.

Groot, the name of Grotius, signifies *Great* in the Flemish language. Hence Vossius, speaking of that celebrated character, says that he was *re et nomine Magnus*.

Mary, Queen of Scots, wrote on a pane of glass, at an Inn, in Buxton :

Buxtona, quæ tepidæ celebrabere numine lymphæ,
Buxtona, forte iterum non adeunda, vale!

The Poet Lainez, who died in 1710, spent all the morning in study, and all the evening at table ; hence he said of himself—

Regnat nocte calix, voluntur biblia mane :
Cum Phœbo Bacchus dividit imperium.

De voce Βούκερος.

AN, quod probabile est ex accentu, veteres Græci dixere βούκερος, a veteri nominativo κέρος (vide Pors. Præf. ad Hecub. p. ix.), seriores βούκερας, ideoque in Choricis, saltem Æschyleis, vetus forma reponenda est? In Odyss. K. 158. varia lectio ὑψίκερον præbet pro vulgatâ ὑψίκερων. *Class. Journ. Vol. XI. p. 65.*

Hanc meam conjecturam firmat vox Latina *bucerus*, quod antea prætermiseram. Vide Lucret. v. 864. vi. 1240. Ovid. Met. vi. 395.
1815. N. A.

ÆNIGMATA.

1. Mitto tibi Navem prora puppique carentem.
2. Si quid dat pars prima mei, pars altera rodit.
3. Nil erimus, totas si vis existere partes :
Omnia, scinde caput, lector amice, sumus.
4. Quem mea præteritis habuerunt mœnia seclis
Vatem, si veritas, hoc modo nomen habent.
5. Primum tolle pedem, tibi fient omnia fausta ;
Inversum, quid sim dicere nemo potest.

6. Sume caput, curram ; ventrem conjunge, volabo ;
Adde pedes, comedes ; et sine ventre bibes.
7. Cortice sub gelido reserant mea viscera flammam.
A capite ad calcem resecare ex ordine membra
Si libeat, varias assumam ex ordine formas :
Spissa viatori jam nunc protenditur umbra ;
Nunc defendo bonos, et amo terrere nocentes ;
Mox intrare veto ; sum denus denique et unus.
Unica si desit milii cauda, silere jubebo.

The inhuman Catherine de Medicis was terrified at the sight of a Comet, which appeared at the time of the League. To that circumstance the following verses allude :

Spargeret horrendas cum tristis in æthere crines,
Venturique daret signa Cometa mali,
Ecce suæ Regina timens male conscia vitæ
Credidit invisum poscere fata caput.
Quid, Regina, times ? namque hæc mala si qua minantur,
Longa timenda tua est, non tua vita brevis.

That we have no characters to express the sounds of the French J, U, or final N, is an assertion of Mitford, History of Greece, c. ii. s. 3. He might have added the French A, and other sounds ; but he probably meant that we have no similar sound in English to J, U, or the nasal N. This is accurate only with respect to U ; for we have the sound of J in our S in the words *measure, pleasure*, &c. and we have the nasal sound in can't, won't, &c. The *l mouillée* is generally thought difficult of pronunciation to those, who do not recollect that we have the same sound in such words as *billiards*.

MOTS OU OMIS PAR H. ETIENNE,

Ou inexactement expliqués.

Par J. B. GAIL, Lecteur et Professeur Royal, de l'Institut de France.

1. ἀνῶσαι. (Thucyd. 8. 93. 2.) H. Etienne (t. iv. p. 766. c.) traduit ἀνῶσαι τὴν πόλιν, *urbem hostibus objectare* : c'est ne rendre ni le sens de ἄνω, ni celui de ῶσαι. Æmilius Portus en donne pour glose,

ἀνατραπέϊσαν ἐς τὰς τῶν πολεμίων χεῖρας ἐμβάλλειν : je l'adopterois à l'exception d' ἐμβάλλειν, qui me paroît faible ; tandis que le grec ὤσαι bien plus énergique, signifie, *urbem protrudere* : ce qui donne l'idée de force et de violence mieux que ἐμβάλλειν. Je proposerois donc : *republicam pessum abeuntem ac interversam in manus hostium protrudere*. Notez que ἀνα ou ἄνω renfermé dans ἀνώσαι dépend, non de ὤσαι exprimé, mais d'un verbe sousentendu, tel que τραπέϊσαν.

Je pourrois citer quantité de verbes dont la préposition dépend de même non du verbe auquel elle est jointe, mais d'un verbe sousentendu : Donnons en deux exemples : διέπεμψαν, pour διαμερίσαντες ἐπεμψαν, (Thucyd. 4. §. 1.) ἐκπλεῦσαι, pour πλεῦσαι ἐκφυγόντες : (Thucyd. 8. 102. 1.) le 8eme livre de Thucydide, que quelques Savans balancent, bien à tort, à attribuer à cet historien, nous fournira beaucoup de locutions aussi remarquables.

2. ἀνδράποdon, vient, nous disent les lexicographes, de ἀνὴρ et de ποῦς, ποδός. Mais c'est prendre pour désinence ce qui tient au radical. Car le dernier α de ἀνδρα n'est nullement désinence de ce mot : il appartient évidemment à l'α d'ἀποδώ. L'analogie et un passage formel de Pausanias prouvent incontestablement que la véritable étymologie est ἀνὴρ et ἀποδώ, *hominem vendō*. Voy. l'article ῥιμφάρματος.

3. ἀσφαλῶς δουλεύειν, Thuc. 2. 63. 2. H. Etienne, t. iii. p. 1172. H. cite ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν *diligenter custodire*. Mais au lieu de cet exemple, ou, si l'on veut, à la suite de cet exemple facile, il convenoit d'en citer un bien autrement difficile. C'est ἀσφαλῶς δουλεύειν de Thuc. 2. 63. 2. *le repos*, dit Periclès, *ne se conserve que combiné avec l'activité*, et il ajoute : *le repos est bon, non dans une ville qui commande, mais dans une ville qui obéit ; et cela pour être assujéti avec moins de danger*, c. à d. *pour rendre son esclavage moins dangereux ; ut securā serviat*. La version de mes devanciers, *neque civitati principatum obtinenti, sed subdita, quietam securamque agere servitutem conducit*, est évidemment fautive. voy. 1° la version latine de mon Thucydide ; 2° mon mémoire sur Thucyd. 3° mon *Demosthène pro coronā* pag. 145, 146. Demosthène a emprunté, entre tant d'autres, cette locution à Thucydide.

4. ἀξίωσις, ἀξίωμα, Thuc. 2. 37. 1. l'illustre Henri Etienne qui paroît trop souvent étranger à l'analogie, dit ἀξίωσις *idem quod* ἀξίωμα. Pour moi, je propose de dire : ἀξίωσις, *l'action de prétendre, postulatio* ; et non pas *postulatum* comme je l'ai dit à tort ; ἀξίωμα *le résultat des prétensions, la dignité, dignitas*. voy. mes essais sur les désinences 2. partie, p. 13. sq. j'essaye d'y prouver que les noms en σις expriment en général *l'action de*, et ceux en μα *l'objet d'action* : que dans toutes les désinences Grecques, Latines, Françaises, en *ma me*, la lettre *m* paroît servir à exprimer *cumulation, agglomération, consistance, solidité, majesté, grandeur* ; que sur le sens de ἀξίωσις, ἀκουσις, ἀκεσις, ἀκόντισις, διάγνωσις, ἐπιτήδευσις, τεύχισις, lesquels diffe-

rent de ἀζιώμα, ἀκουσμα, ἀκεσμα, ἀκόντισμα, διαγνώμη, ἐπιτήδευμα, ρείχισμα, et sur tant d'autres H. Etienne, Cattier, Abresch, Bauer, Ducker, et avant eux Budée, Thomas Magister, et Denys d'Halicarnasse lui-même se sont mépris.

5. διαγνώσις discussion ; διαγνώμη résultat de la discussion. voy. mon Demosth. pro coronâ p. 120. et mes désinences 2. partie, p. 14.

6. δειδήμονες. (Hom. II. β. 56.) H. Etienne le rend par *timidus, meticulosus*, et cite le v. 56. de l'II. ἀλλὰ μάλα Τρῶες δειδήμονες ; conformément à cette version d'Etienne, M. Bitaubé qualifie les Troyens de *timides*, et un autre de *lâches*. Homere qui 3. 36. et *passim* les appelle ἀγεράων et 3. 131. ἱπποδάμων, a-t-il bien eu la pensée de traiter les Troyens de lâches, et de mettre cette épithète dans la bouche d'un héros Troyen qui eût ainsi insulté sa nation. Je ne puis me le persuader. Je crois donc que la paraphrase du vers est : *les Troyens sont trop respectueux pour un des fils de leur roi, nimis verecundi*. Cependant le respect ne va pas sans un certain sentiment de crainte. Dans l'Iliade, chant 3. 172. et ch. 24. 435. ces 2 sentiments sont exprimés et réunis dans un seul et même vers. Voy. mon Thucyd. t. 9. p. 122. et mes obs. sur Thucyd. p. 78. sq.

7. ἐγέρσιμος ὕπνος. H. Est. traduit d'après Nonnus, *somnus à quo aliquis excitari potest*. Fortifions son exemple d'un vers de Théocrite non compris (id. 24. 7.) c'est ἐγέρσιμον ὕπνον, qui signifie non pas *un sommeil suivi d'un doux reveil*, comme le veut M. Geoffroy, mais *un sommeil suivi de réveil, un sommeil qui ne soit pas celui de la mort* : idée pleine de sensibilité, qui fait allusion au danger qu'avoit couru le fils d'Alcmène de dormir sans s'éveiller jamais.

8. ἑσθασίς, (Thuc. 7, 30, 1 et 2.) mot composé, omis par H. Etienne, Robertson et autres lexicographes. Nous lisons dans Thucydide (l. 1.) ἐν τῇ ἑσθάσει. On le traduit par *dum naves conscenderent*, version admise par le savant M. Douka : mais je propose, *dum naves peterent* : version qu'ailleurs j'expliquerai logiquement.

9. Θράκη et τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης. H. Et. se fait sur τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης. On rendoit communément ces deux locutions par *la Thrace* ; mais en réfléchissant et sur le génie de la langue et sur des faits historiques que je développe dans un mémoire, je proposerois *la Thrace*, au premier ; et *l'épi-thrace* ou *villes épithraces*, au second : denomination qui indiqueroit les colonies Grecques établies sur la mer Egée, depuis la presqu'île de la Pallène jusqu'à Byzance, et auxquelles les Athéniens, à une époque indiquée par Thucydide, (8, 64, 1.) donnèrent un gouverneur ; ce que notre historien n'annonce pas comme une création de place. Un helléniste François fort habile ne partage point mon

opinion, et traduit τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης par *les pays de la Thrace* ; ou *les affaires de la Thrace* : version conforme à celle de l'interprète Latin qui donne *ad obscundas res Thraciæ*, tandis que Hudson le rend par *in Thraciam pergens*. Mais je crois tous les deux fautifs. Un mémoire que j'ai composé sur ce point de critique grammaticale et géographique, peut seul apporter la conviction.

ε 10. κότος. Selon Etienne, d'après Eustathe, κότος se met simplement pour χόλος. Eustathe parloit-il ainsi d'après ce vers où Homère (Il. 3, 220.) dans son admirable portrait d'Ulysse, dit qu'il étoit ζάκοτον. On le traduit par *iracundum*. Mais dira t-on d'un *iracundus*, ce que dit Homère de son Ulysse, στάσκειν, ἵπαι δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ Χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας. Ἀστεμφές, &c. ? Non certes. Rejettons donc le *furiosum* de Politus, l'*iracundum* de l'illustre M. Heyne. Ces épithètes supposent une colère qui se manifeste par une agitation extérieure. Or l'Ulysse d'Homère, loin de se laisser aller à des mouvements violents, à une agitation extérieure, concentre sa colère : il tient son sceptre immobile, il a le regard louche, et la figure d'un imbécille (ἄφρονα, Il. 3, 220.) Ζάκοτος se dira d'un homme qui couve un profond ressentiment. Quant à κότος, il ne peut être synonyme de χόλος. Homère lui même réfutera Eustathe dans ces vers : (Il. i. 81, 82.) *Lorsqu'un roi en veut à quelqu'un, il peut bien, un moment, arrêter les transports de sa colère, (χόλον) mais le ressentiment (κότον) n'habite pas moins dans son ame, jusqu'à ce qu'il lui ait donné tout son effet.* Voy. κοτέοντε, Il. 3, 345, κότος, (Il. 13, 416) avec le sens de *ressentiment* ; et χόλος, avec l'acception de *colère*, Il. i. 224 ; i. 387 ; vi. 23 ; x. 106, 107.

11. πάνδοκος. (Pindare Ol. 3, 30.) H. Etienne traduit *qui quemlibet hospitio excipit ; omnes capiens*. Pindare employe ce mot en parlant de l'Hiéron, ou enceinte sacrée de l'Olympie. Cet Hiéron ayant presque l'étendue d'une cité, n'est-il pas probable que πάνδοκος signifie *omnia capiente*, plutôt que *omnes accipiente* ? l'Hiéron qui embrasse tout, pour qui embrasse tant d'objets précieux, où se livrent tant de combats fameux, &c. &c. n'est-il pas préférable à l'Hiéron hospitalier de l'illustre M. Heyne, ou à l'Hiéron qui héberge tout le monde d'un autre savant ? L'analogie ne le dit-elle pas ? Pour avoir *omnes capiente*, παντ eût été, je crois, nécessaire dans la formation du composé : n'ayant que πᾶν, je traduirois par *omne*, et non par *omnes*. Dans cet article, j'ai dit l'Olympie, pour le territoire d'Olympie ; car je n'admets pas de ville d'Olympie. Il n'a manqué à cette prétendue ville si fameuse que d'avoir existé. Voyez *Pindex critique de l'atlas géographique de mon Xénophon grec-françois* Latin, dix Vol. in 4to.

12. πεδιάς, ἄδος, ἡ. H. Etienne, au mot πεδινὸς traduit le subst. par *planities*, comme πεδίον. Mais ces deux mots diffèrent : πεδίον sign. plaine ; πεδιάς vaste et immense plaine. Voy. 1°. *mes essais sur les désinences*. obs. prélim. p. xvi. ; 2°. *mes idiotismes grecs*, 2^{de} édit. p. 208.

13. προσφθεγκτός φωνῆς 68. Sophocles Philoct. v. 1096, edit. de Vauvil. donne trois mots : le Schol. donne pour glose προσφωνηθῆναι ἄετος. Bruck de la répète. Au lieu de la juger fautive, H. Etienne donne προσφθεγκτικός au lieu de προσφθεγκτός, (méconnoissant ainsi les principes des désinences ; car il existe une grande différence entre les désinences τος et κτικός) puis cite la glose. L'ingénieux mais souvent trop hardi Wakefield propose de substituer φωνῇ à φωνῆς. Pour moi, je proposerois 1°. de réintégrer dans H. Et. προσφθεγκτός qu'il a omis ; 2°. de traduire *ayant l'oreille frappée de la voix de toi* ; et plus litt. *frappé par le son de la voix de toi* (φωνῆς régi par πρὸς). J'ajouterois enfin que désormais dans les lexiques, προσφθεγκτός ne doit pas être cité sans être suivi de σοῦ φωνῆς qui est comme l'appendice de προσφθεγκτός.

14. ῥιμφάρματος. (Sophocle, Œd. c. 1117. edit. Vauvil.) H. Etienne omet ce mot. Robertson, lexicographe soigné, le donne ainsi que le mot précédent, et le traduit par *qui celeriter curru fertur* ; version adoptée par un de nos savans qui le rend par *porté rapidement sur un char, qui fait voler son char avec rapidité*. Cette version est-elle bonne ? je ne le crois pas. Sur quoi fonde t'il l'acception, *porté sur un char* ? Sur la désinence souvent passive τος : mais dans τος le τ appartient, non à la désinence mais au radical ἄρματος. En réfléchissant donc sur les principes des désinences, je dirois que ῥιμφάρματος joint à ἀμίλλαις (Soph. Œd. c. 1117, 1118.) signifie *chars rapides*. La version de *curulibus præliis* vaut mieux que celle de *curribus* de Bruck, qui en la donnant devoit bien, dans ses notes, présenter un Supplément à cette version. ἀμίλλαις ῥιμφ. de l'Œd. c. me rappelle l'ἀμίλλαις χαλαργοῖς de l'Electre (867) du même tragique. Le premier des deux mots composés montre le char ; le second, les coursiers.

15. σπεύδω τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, *ad principatum propere*. D'après cette version de H. Etienne, voila deux généreux citoyens transformés en vils intrigants. voy. mes obs. sur l'*Thucydide*, 5, 16, 1.

16. συνθνήσκειν. H. Etienne l'admet et cite Sophocle qui l'emploie dans son Philoct. v. 1488. mais comme les plus grands critiques, ne le comprenant pas, l'ont corrigé ; licence que je combats dans mon Philoctete, expliquons le vers que cite, sans l'expliquer, H. Etienne : *car la piété (συνθνήσκει) transmigre avec les mortels religieux, avec eux trépassé, avec eux va dans l'autre vie, avec eux se rejoint aux dieux*.

En terminant cet article, permettez, Monsieur le Redacteur, que j'aye l'honneur d'annoncer à vos compatriotes mon *Thucydide Grec, Franç. Latin*, que j'ai souvent cité dans les précédentes explications.¹

¹ On s'empresse d'y porter l'attention des lecteurs du Journal dans le Prospectus du Xénophon du savant auteur, p. 227.—Ed.

Literary Intelligence.

A Corrected Catalogue of the late Mr. Lunn's books ; with the prices affixed ; for ready money. Price 3s.

* We cannot refrain from recording the following *Biographical Memoir* of Mr. L. written by that illustrious scholar, Dr. PARKER, whose actions are always foremost in the cause of humanity ; and prefixed to the Catalogue.

" Mr. Lunn resided as a Bookseller at Cambridge for ten years. In March 1797 he came to London, and succeeded Mr. Samuel Hayes in Oxford Street. On his removal into Soho Square in 1801, he, by the advice of Scholars and with the approbation of friends, established the CLASSICAL LIBRARY upon a new and extensive plan. His views were announced in a perspicuous and even elegant Advertisement, in which, with a tone of thinking far raised above the narrow and selfish views of a mind intent only upon profit, he endeavoured to interest in his own favor such persons, as habitually look with veneration to the memory of Bentley, to the erudition of Hemsterhuis, and his illustrious School, and to the sagacity, taste, and learning of our celebrated countryman, Richard Porson.

" Other Booksellers had been accustomed to provide for purchasers publications in the modern, as well as the ancient languages : Mr. Lunn resolved to act up faithfully and rigorously to the name, which he had chosen for his own collection. He immediately entered into various and important negotiations with Booksellers upon the continent. He confined his attention to such Works, as were interesting to Scholars only. But, in order to supply their demands, he took a wide and varied range. With an activity, and perhaps we may add, magnanimity, which men of learning cannot fail to applaud, he ventured to bring together many *Principes Editiones*. He did not shrink from the purchase of other editions, expensive from their bulk, their splendor, or their rarity. He amassed large numbers of the *Delphin Editions*, and of those, which are called *Variorum*. He was upon the watch to procure new editions of classical works published by foreign Scholars of his own time, and he took the most judicious measures for obtaining them early. To critical and philological Books he was peculiarly attentive ; and whether we consider the number or the usefulness of those, which the CLASSICAL LIBRARY supplied, we cannot wonder that the zeal and the judgment of Mr. Lunn in collecting them attracted the notice of the curious, and the favor of the learned.

" The ardor of his mind induced him to take a large share in valuable and costly publications from the presses of Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and London. The cost of reprinting Brotier's Tacitus under the superintendence of Mr. Valpy fell upon

Mr. Lunn only. Among other Works, in which he was concerned with respectable men of the trade, *Wakefield's Lucretius*, *Ernesti's Cicero*, *Drakenborch's Livy*, *Schlesinger's Lexicon*, *Morell's Thesaurus*, improved and enlarged by Dr. Maltby, and *Scapula's Lexicon*, deserve to be enumerated. He had engaged to take several copies of the Herodotus, which is now preparing for the press by Professor Schweighaeuser; and in consequence of the connexions, which he had gradually formed with the literati of this kingdom, he so far deviated from his original design, as to undertake the publication of a few Tracts in the Oriental Languages.

"His vigilance and integrity were manifested in the good condition of his Books; and perhaps we have to commend his munificence, rather than his discretion, in the fondness which he occasionally indulged for costly bindings. His pride indeed was gratified by the consciousness of pursuing such measures, as were alike agreeable to the opulent collector and the profound scholar.

"The fortune, which Mr. Lunn inherited from his Father, was very inconsiderable. On his first settlement in London, a part of the property bequeathed to him ultimately by his Uncle, Mr. R. Labutte, a French Teacher in the University of Cambridge, and amounting nearly to 10,000*l.*, came into his possession, and enabled him doubtless for some time to carry on with effect the concerns of the CLASSICAL LIBRARY. For this advantage he was indebted to the kindness of an Aunt, whose confidence in his honesty, and whose solicitude for his welfare, induced her to give up during her life a portion of that money, which by the Will of the Uncle was to descend to Mr. Lunn at her decease. Observing the importance of this concession in facilitating the success of Mr. Lunn, this excellent Woman was afterwards led, from the same motives of kindness, to transfer for his use the remainder before the month of January 1808, when she died. In the growing prosperity of Mr. Lunn, in his probity, and his gratitude she received the just reward of her unfeigned and disinterested friendship.

"The whole of Mr. Lunn's property was embarked in his trade, and under circumstances more favorable his accumulation must have been rapid. But he had to struggle with unusual and most stubborn difficulties. Insurances were high—Goods were often delayed, for which Mr. Lunn had been obliged to pay before they reached him—The course of exchange ran for many years against England, and the loss, which Mr. Lunn sustained from this cause on the amount of the invoices, was sometimes 20, sometimes 25, and sometimes even 30 per cent. The sale of books, procured under these unavoidable and irremediable disadvantages, was in many instances slow and precarious. Mr. Lunn, like every other Bookseller, was doomed to losses from the inability of his employers to make their payments. He dealt with men, whose rank, whose delicacy, and upon some occasions whose poverty protected them from that importunity, with which the generality of tradesmen enforce their claims. He rarely expected immediate payment—he never demanded it—he allowed for it a reasonable discount—and in the mean time, for the support of his credit both at home and abroad,

he was compelled to fulfil his own engagements without deduction and without delay.

"We have now to record the chief cause of those embarrassments, which disturbed his spirits, and shortened his existence. The return of peace, by opening a free communication with the Continent, was beneficial to other traders, but most injurious to Mr. Lunn. They accumulated their stock without the numerous impediments, which Mr. Lunn had encountered. They were exempt from many of those restrictions upon importation, to which Mr. Lunn had for many years been obliged to submit. They were able to buy, and therefore to sell, at a cheap rate those articles, for which Mr. Lunn had previously paid to foreigners a very high price. They purchased after a favorable alteration in the course of exchange, and with considerable diminution in charges for insurance.

"Disappointed in his expectations—alarmed at the prospect of impending losses—perplexed by the application of creditors, whose demands he had frequently satisfied with exemplary punctuality—conscious of having exhausted the whole of his property in procuring loans, some of which he might be obliged to sell at a less price than that, which he had advanced for them—unaccustomed to propitiate the severe by supplication, to trick the artful by evasion, and to distress the friendly by delay, he was suddenly bereaved of that self-command, which, if he could have preserved it, would eventually have secured for him unsullied respectability, undiminished prosperity, and undisturbed tranquillity. But in the poignant anguish of his soul delicacy prevailed over reason, and panic over fortitude—Every expedient proposed by his faithful and affectionate advisers was at one moment adopted with gratitude, and at the next rejected with phrenzy—Every present inconvenience was magnified into an insurmountable obstacle—Every possible future mischance was anticipated as an inevitable and ruinous calamity—To his disordered imagination retreat seemed impracticable—To his unaltered and unalterable sense of honor resistance appeared unjustifiable—By his wounded pride submission was deemed alike ignominious and inefficacious—He reflected, and was impatient of reflection—he hoped, and was ashamed of hope—he approved, and disapproved—he decided, and hesitated—he despaired, and perished.

"Happily for the human race, all the extenuations, which accompany such cases, are reserved for the tribunal of that Being, who knoweth of what we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust. In the mean time many a Christian will be disposed to commiserate the circumstances of Mr. Lunn's death, and many a man of letters may find reason to deplore the loss of his well meant, and well directed labors.

"Unfortunately Mrs. Lunn and her daughters have not the means of continuing the business, in which Mr. Lunn was engaged. Their doom is to lament an affectionate husband and an indulgent father. Their only resources lie in the exertions of their friends, and in the good will of every wise and every virtuous man, who contemplates the

acuteness of their sufferings, and who from experience can appreciate the worth of their nearest relative, and most beloved protector.

"For the satisfaction of such persons enough has been already stated, and to others, who are seldom inclined to pardon human frailties, or to pity human woes, more would be urged in vain.

"It remains for us more directly to lay open the purposes, for which the Catalogue is intended, and the principle, by which it was regulated.

"The debts of Mr. Lunn amount to eight thousand pounds. The worth of the property, which he has left behind him, is supposed to exceed that sum. His Executor is anxious to discharge those debts by the speedy sale of his effects, and to employ the surplus in making provision for Mrs. Lunn, and her two daughters. In order to facilitate the sale of the stock in Soho-Square, the price of every common and every choice article has been considerably reduced, and every possible encouragement has been given for literary men to partake of the various and precious treasures offered to them. It cannot often happen that books so valuable will be presented to their choice at so moderate a price. It may never be in their power again to gratify once their curiosity, and their benevolence. They are respectfully invited to mark the good opinion which they formerly entertained of Mr. Lunn himself for skillfulness in his profession, and probity in his dealings. They are earnestly entreated to manifest their good will to a family, deprived of his protection, mourning for his death, and depending upon the successful sale of his books and other property as the only expedient, which can procure for them the necessary comforts and reasonable conveniences of life.

"SAMUEL PARR, LL.D.

"THOMAS KIDD, A.M. Trin. Coll. Cam.

"EDMUND HENRY BARKER, Trin. Coll. Camb.

"ROBERT MASTERS KERRISON, New Burlington St.

"THOMAS EDWARDS, Executor, Soho Square."

The catalogue of the books published at the Leipsig Easter fair 1815, having just arrived, we extract for the use of our readers the titles of the principal works on Classical and Biblical Criticism. Catalogues have been procured by Bohte, York Street, Covent Garden, who also has imported many of the books contained in the annexed list.

Acta philologorum Monacensium, edid. Fr. Thiersch. 8vo. Monachii. 1815.

Aristophanis Comæd. edidit Phil. Invernizzio. Tom. VI. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Æschinis et Demosthenis Orationes de Corona. Recensuit Im. Bekker. Accedunt Schol. Part. inedita 8vo. Halæ, 1815.

Æschinis Oratoris opera, ad fidem optim. libr. edita. 12. Lips. 1815.

Anonymi *Economica*, quæ vulgo Aristotelis falso ferebantur. E libris scriptis. et vers. antiqua emendavit J. G. Schneider, 8vo. Lips. 1813.

Antholog. Græc. ad fidem Cod. Parisini. ex apograph. Gothano. edidit. Jacobs. tom. II. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Apollonii Rhod. Argon. ad opt. libror. fidem accurate edit. 18. Lips. 1815. Benedicti T. F. Comment. Crit. in VIII. Thucydidis libros, 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Caparis Jul. Comment. de bello Gallico et Civili. 8vo. Marburg: 1814.

Ciceronis M. T. Orat. Philipp. 2da. übersetzt und mit einem nach Handschriften berichtigen Texte von M. G. G. Wernsdorf. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Ciceronis Op. ad fid. opt. libr. accurate edita tom. I—III. Rhetorica contin. 12. Lips. 1814.

Op. quæ supersunt omnia ac deperditor. fragm. cum var. lectus. lect. edidit, C. G. Schütz. tom. III—VI. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Histor. Philosoph. antiq. ed. F. Gedike. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Trium Oratt. pro Scauro, pro Tullio, pro Flacco partes ineditæ, cum scholiis inedit. recensuit et not. illustravit, P. Maius. 8vo. Francf. 1815.

Corpus historic. lat. cura F. E. Rühkopf. et J. D. Seebode. tom. V. Velleium Patere. cont. 8vo. Hanov. 1815.

Tom. XV. p. 1. Sext. Rufum. cont. Ib.

Tom. XV. p. 2. S. Rufi de regionib. urb. Rom. libellus edidit et Comment. instruxit. G. Münich. Ib.

Eichhorn's J. G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3 bds. 2te hälste. 8vo. Lips. 1814.

Die Weltgeschichte 2r. Theil. 3r. und 4r. Bänd. 8vo. Göttingen. 1814.

Eichhorn's Literaturgeschichte 2te hälste. 8vo. Göttingen, 1814.

Epistola D. Jacobi I. atque Petri I. cum versione germanica et commentar. lat. edidit J. J. Hottingerus 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Euripidis Tragœdiæ et fragmenta. cum scholiis gr. e codd. MSS. et versione Latina. Edidit Aug. Matthiæ. tom. III. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Frank O. Fragmente eines Versuchs über die dynamische Sprachzeugung nach Vergleichungen der Persischen, Indischen, und Deutschen Sprachen und Mythen. 8vo. Nürnberg, 1815.

Freytag, G. W. F. carmen Arabicum perpetuo commentario, et versione iambica germanica illustratum. 8vo. Göttingen, 1815.

Friedrich, C. G. Symbolæ philologicocrit. et lectionis varietatem continentes ad interpretationem Psal. CX. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Gesenius, G. de Pentateuch. Samar. origine, indole, et auctoritate, commentatio. 4to. Halæ. 1815.

Kritische Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Geusau, A. von, Geschichte der Römischen und Griechischen Kaiser, von Julius Cæsar bis Franz. II. mit ihren Vildnissen. 5 bde. 4to. Wien. 1814.

Griesbach's D. J. J. Vorlesungen über die Hermeneutik des N. T. mit Anwendung auf die Leidens und Auferstehungsgeschichte Christi. Herausgeg. von I. C. S. Steiner. 8vo. Nürnberg. 1815.

Halbkart. C. G. Tentamina criseos in difficilioribus quibusd., auct. vet. et Græc. et Lat. locis. 8vo. Wratislav. 1813.

Haldersonii, Biörn. Lexicon Island. Lat. Danicum, edidit Raskius. tom. II. 4to. Havniæ. 1815.

Homeri Ilias, Gr. et Lat. cura J. G. Hageri tom. I. 8vo. Chemnitz. 1815.

Homer's Werke, übersetzt von J. H. Voss. 4 bde. 8vo. Tübing. 1814.

Horatii op. recensuit C. F. Döring. tom. I. 8vo. Tübing.

Jacobs, Fr. Elementarbuch der griechischen Sprache für Anfänger. ir. Thl. ir. u. 2r. cursus, 8vo. Jena 1815.

Ἰαμβλίχου Χαλκηδῆως περὶ βίου Πυθαγορίκου λόγος. Iamblichi Chalc. de vit. Pythagorica liber. Textum post Lud. Kusterum ad fid. codd. MSS. recognovit, Ulr. Obrechtii interpret. passim mutavit, Kusteri aliorumque animadd. adjecit suas M. T. Kiessling. Accedit Porphyrius de vit. Pythag. &c. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Lowth Rob. de Poesi Sacr. Hebr. Prælect. Not. J. D. Michaelis suis animadd. auxit F. C. Rosenmüller. Accedit C. F. Richter, de atate lib. Jobi defin. et Weissn de metro Hariano Comment. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Matthiæ, P. Handbuch der Griechischen und Römischen Literatur 8vo. Jena. 1815.

— Prologus de Pherecydis fragmento. 4to. Altenburg, 1815. Meinecke, A. Curæ Crit. in connecor. fragm. ab Athenæo servata. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Ovidii, P. N. quæ supersunt, ad opt. libr. fid. accurate edit. Tom. i. 18mo. Lips. 1815.

Pappelbaum, G. T. Cod. MS. Græc. Apost. Act. et Epist. continent. Berolin. asservatum, descripsit, conulit, animad. crit. adjecit. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Platonis opera, ex recens. Stephani, adject. Scholiis et not. crit. edidit C. D. Beck. tom. II. 12mo. Lips. 1815.

Plutarchi Vitæ. edidit G. H. Schaefer. tom. VIII—IX. 12mo. Lips. 1815.

— Edidit A. Coray. 8vo. Paris. 1815.

Poetæ Gr. Gnomici ad opt. lib.^{*} fid. acc. edit. 18mo. Lips. 1815.

Rulinkenii ad Velleium Paterc. Not. Integr. 8vo. Hanover. 1815.

Sappho's Oden, griechisch, und deutsch mit erklärenden anmerk. von E. A. L. Möbius. 8vo. Hannover, 1815.

Stiæbelis, M. C. G. *Ἑλληνικά* seu antiquiss. græcor. historiae res insigniores usque ad Olympiad. i. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Spitzner, Fr. de versu Græcorum heroico, maxime Homericò. Accedit M. Fr. Tr. Fridemann Dissertatio de media Syllaba Pentametri Græcorum elegiaci. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Spohn, F. A. G. de agro Trojano in carm. Hom. descripto, Commentatio. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Stössner, C. C. explicatio vulgaris et orthodoxa locor. Ebr. i. 3. et Col. i. 17. ab injuriis recentiorum interpretum vindicat. 4to. Lips. 1815.

Stügnididis Eleg. Ex fide MSS.^{*} recensuit, et auxit, c. not. Fr. Særgii et R. Fr. Phil. Brunckii, Imman. Bekker. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Thiersch, F. Griechische Grammatik für Schulen. 8vo. Leipz. 1815.

Twesteni, A. Comment. crit. de Hesiodi Carm. quod inscribitur Opera et Dies 8vo. Kiliæ. 1815.

Walchii, D. G. L. Emendationes Livianæ. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Xenophontis Opusc. polit. equestr. et venat. accedit Arriani libellus de venatione, cura J. G. Schneideri 8vo. Lips. 1815.

—Quæ extant, recens. et interpretatus est J. G. Schneider. Tom. vi. Lips. 1815.

—De Cyri disciplina, libr. viii. edidit J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

CLASSICAL.

Prospectus de la Traduction complète des Œuvres de Xénophon par J. B. Gail, Lecteur royal. [*L'ouvrage se vend, à Paris, chez Auguste Delalain, Imprimeur-Libraire, rue des Mathurins-Saint-Jacques; et chez Charles Gail neveu, au Collège royal, place Cambrai.*]

Les Œuvres complètes de Xénophon (onze volumes in-4.^o), comprenant, Texte grec, Versions latine et françoise, Observations historiques et critiques, Collation et *specimen* de ma-

^{*} Avec les beaux caractères de Garamont, qui, trop rarement employés depuis Louis XIV. ont été remis en activité pour cette édition.

manuscrits, Cartes géographiques, Tableaux chronologiques, Plans de batailles et de sièges, et une belle collection d'estampes, d'après les dessins de MM. le Barbier, Boichot et Moreau, seront distribuées en sept livraisons, dont la première a paru le 20 Décembre 1814, et les autres successivement de mois en mois. Elles n'éprouveront aucun retard; car tout est imprimé et gravé. Si le tirage des estampes et cartes, qui exige beaucoup de soins, étoit terminé, on pourroit, au moment même, se procurer tout l'ouvrage. Il pourra être demandé, en son entier (l'Atlas excepté), par ceux qui consentiront à réunir les estampes dans l'Atlas, vœu exprimé par plusieurs souscripteurs.

Quoique cet ouvrage, décoré d'estampes, s'annonce avec une sorte de magnificence qui semble devoir en augmenter le prix, on s'apercevra facilement que les propriétaires¹ ont satisfait, par sa modicité réelle, au vœu de l'auteur, qui a voulu rendre accessible à toutes les fortunes le Fénélon de la Grèce.

Prix des sept livraisons, 160 francs, beau papier ordinaire et 320 francs, papier vélin satiné. Il en existe 45 exemplaires, estampes avant la lettre et eau-forte. Ceux qui n'auront pas souscrit au 1^{er}. juin paieront 200 francs au lieu de 160 francs, et 400 francs au lieu de 320 francs.

L'Avertissement annonce les *Observations militaires et géographiques de M. Guil*; d'après Xénophon et autres auteurs. Quoique très-utiles à la lecture de Xénophon, dont elles expliquent souvent le texte, elles feront néanmoins un ouvrage à part, lequel aura plusieurs volumes. Le 1^{er}. volume, in-8.^o, sera donné *gratis* aux souscripteurs de Xénophon, lors de la septième livraison. Chacun des volumes suivans leur coûtera 5 francs : 10 francs chaque volume pour les non-souscripteurs de Xénophon.

Nota. Thucydide, et Xénophon son continuateur, allant ensemble, on rappelle que le prix de Thucydide, grec-latin-françois, in-4.^o, papier vélin, est de 145 fr.; papier ordinaire, 80 francs. Le même, in-8.^o, 45 francs.

La collection complète (in 4.^o, papier vélin, estampes avant la lettre,) contenant Xénophon, Thucydide, Théocrite, Musée, Anacréon, Mythologie de Lucien, 506 francs.—La même collection, papier ordinaire, fig. après la lettre, 280 francs.

On a tiré deux exemplaires de Xénophon, peau vélin satiné, dont un exemplaire est complet et à vendre.

¹ L'ouvrage (imprimé en grande partie aux frais du Gouvernement) appartient en toute propriété, d'après un acte passé par-devant notaire, à un particulier qui a fait imprimer à ses frais une partie de l'ouvrage, et graver à ses frais l'Atlas tout entier et la collection des estampes. J'ai dû faire cette remarque, étant forcé de déroger, pour Xénophon, à l'usage où j'étois de faire, à des gens de lettres, hommage de cinquante à soixante exemplaires de chacun de mes ouvrages.

M. Tullii Ciceronis trium Orationum in Clodium et Curionem de ære alieno Milonis, de Rege Alexandrino, Fragmenta inedita; Item ad tres prædictas Orationes, et ad alias Tullianas quatuor editas commentarius antiquius ineditus, qui videtur Asconii Pediani; Scholia insuper antiqua et inedita, quæ videntur excerpta e Commentario deperdito ejusdem Asconii Pediani ad alias rursus quatuor Ciceronis editas Orationes—Omnium ex antiquissimis MSS. cum Criticis notis edebat *Angelus Maius* Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ a linguis orientalibus Mediolani.

In the month of November, 1814, the literary world was informed of a discovery of a manuscript in the Ambrosian library at Milan, containing some fragments of three Orationes of Cicero, which were supposed to have been lost; the publication of these was almost immediately followed by that of several fragments of three other Orationes of Cicero, which had also been discovered in the library; together with an ample commentary, supposed to be by Asconius Pedianus on the above, and on eight others of Cicero's Orationes, which had been already published.

The first of the inedited Orationes of Cicero is "In P. Clodium et Curionem," that is relative to a violation of public decorum committed by P. Clodius during the ceremonies of sacrifice to the Goddess *Bona*.

The second is entitled, "De ære alieno Milonis," that is, respecting the debts of Milo, and was pronounced on the occasion of that person becoming candidate for the Consulate.—The discovery of the fragments of this Oration is of great importance, as it does not appear that the learned had preserved any record of its ever having existed.

The third inedited Oration is entitled "De Rege Alexandrino," and was delivered in a discussion which took place in the Roman Senate respecting the re-establishment of Ptolemaus Auletes on the throne of Egypt.

The Fragments of Cicero are illustrated by an inedited and ample commentary, which has also been discovered, and is now published for the first time. It relates to the Orationes already published of Cicero, pro Archia, pro Sylla, pro Plancio, in Vatinius: and also (but with much more brevity) to the Orationes Quarta Catilinaria, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro.

This commentary is highly valuable on several accounts—1st, as it is extremely probable, nay, almost certain, that it is the production of Asconius Pedianus—2ndly, because it is of the purest Latinity, is replete with historical allusions and illustrations, and contains some Latin words, of which we had no knowledge—3dly, It refers to two productions of Cicero, of which we were altogether ignorant, viz. Edictum L. Racillii Tr. Pl. in invectione

pem P. Clodii, and "Epistola ad instar voluminis de consulatu suo ad Pompeium." It also contains an inedited passage of the comic author Afranius, and an interesting Fragment of an Oration of the tribune of the people Caius Gracchus.

The discoverer and editor of these Fragments has prefixed to them a dissertation, wherein he relates the manner in which the discovery was made, and points out its classical importance. He then enumerates all the arguments on which he founds his opinion, that the commentary is that part of Asconius Pedianus, of which the injuries and accidents of time had deprived us. He examines with critical acuteness, and endeavours to ascertain the precise period at which Asconius wrote, a subject on which ancient and modern writers have been divided in opinion. The result of his researches is, that Asconius, the commentator of Cicero, was acquainted with Virgil and Livy, that he continued his literary pursuits at a very advanced age under the Emperor Claudius.—Finally, he discusses the age of the manuscripts from which he has taken these Fragments, and proves their great antiquity.

The editor has illustrated the Fragments of Tully, and the commentary with Notes, explanatory of the ancient Text; and has added accurate engravings of the characters in which the manuscript was written, from whence the work is taken.

A copy of the above having been obtained from Milan, it will soon be republished in this country.

ORIENTAL.

Extract of a Memoir, By DR. CAREY, DR. MARSHMAN, and MR. WARD.

The languages, in which we are now translating and printing the Scriptures in the Middle of India, are, the Sungskrit, the Bengalee, the Orissa, the Mahratta, and the Hindce, with its dialects, the Brij-bhasa, and those current in Oodya-pore and Joy-pore.

1. The *Sungskrit*.—The Sungskrit, as the parent of the other Indian Dialects, demands the first place. It has been already said, that in this language the New Testament and the Pentateuch have been long printed. The Historical Books are nearly printed off, the Second Book of the Chronicles being now in the press.

2. *Bengalee*.—In the Bengalee Language, the fourth edition of the New Testament, containing five thousand copies, is more than half through the press. This is the largest edition we have yet printed, and we have reason to think, the most accurate, as the corrections made in it, which are by no means few, are the fruit of twenty years' acquaintance with the language.

3. The *Orissa*.—In this dialect, four volumes of the Scriptures have been long published; and this year will probably complete the printing of the whole Scriptures. The Pentateuch is printed to the middle

of Leviticus. The publication of the other parts of the Old Testament has been already particularized.

4. The *Mahratta*.—In this language, among the most extensive of the dialects of India, the New Testament and the Pentateuch are in circulation. Of the Historical Books in the press, five books are printed off, the First Book of Kings being begun. The translation of the whole Scriptures in this language, the Psalms excepted, has been long finished.

5. The *Hindee*.—This language, which, with its varieties, embraces so great a part of India, has long had both the New Testament and the Pentateuch in circulation; and the increasing desire manifested for the Scriptures, has exhausted the first edition of the former, and called for more than half the latter, which consisted of a thousand copies each. A second edition of the New Testament may be said to be finished, as only a few chapters of the Revelations remain to be printed off. This edition consists of four thousand copies.

6. The *Brij-bhasa*.—In this dialect, esteemed by Gilchrist the purest dialect of the Hindee, and which is spoken in the upper parts of Sindoostan, from Agra to Sirdhana, the Gospels are printed as far as St. Luke, which is in the press. Mr. Chamberlain, now at Sirdhana, is vigorously advancing with the rest of the Scriptures, for which his acquaintance with Hindee in general, as well as that dialect in particular, eminently qualifies him. The following versions may be considered as varieties of the Hindee.

7. The *Joypore*.—This variety of the Hindee is spoken in the little territory of this name, which lies west of Agra toward Guzurat, and is governed by its own Prince. The points in which this dialect differs from the Hindee are not very numerous, the great body of the language being the same. The alteration, however, of a few terminations, and a few leading words of frequent recurrence, to acquire which would cost a man, accustomed to philological studies, scarcely a month, causes such a difference to the unlearned and the poor, for whom the word of God is intended, as to render the version which has it perspicuous, while one without it will be scarcely intelligible, and be therefore laid aside. As this version is printed in the Naguree Character, it is already in the press, and a few chapters of St. Matthew printed off.

8. *Oodyapore*.¹—South-west of Agra, and toward Bombay, lies the district of *Oodyapore*, governed by its own prince, which differs in certain instances both from the Hindee, and from the other dialects spoken around. The character, however, is the same. The Gospel of St. Matthew in this version is also in the press. There are several other dialects of the Hindee, for which preparations of the same kind are making, as that of Bekaneer, west of Joypore, and of Marwar, still farther west, which will almost complete the Scriptures in the various dialects of Hindee. Having thus mentioned the dialects in the

¹ Pinkerton, "Oodypour."

middle part of India in which we are engaged, we turn to those in the south.

9. The *Telinga*.—The languages on the southern side of India in which we are engaged are two, the Telinga and the Kurnata. In the Telinga, a very large fount of types is now prepared, and the printing of the New Testament advanced as far as St. Luke's Gospel. The whole of the New Testament is translated; and a considerable progress made in the Pentateuch.

10. The *Kurnata*.—In this language, which begins to the south where the Malhatta ends, and is current through the whole of the Mysore Country, the alteration requisite in the types has caused some delay; but we have at length been enabled to complete a suitable fount of types, and to put the Gospel by St. Matthew to press. The translation of the New Testament is finished, and the Pentateuch begun.

11. The *Kankona*.—The Kankona is the first to the west of India in which we are engaged. This language begins where the Malhatta ends to the west, and is spoken from Bombay to Goa. In this the New Testament is nearly translated, and the Gospel by St. Matthew is in the press. The type is the Deva-Naguree.

12. The *Wutch*.—Still more to the north-west, on this side the Indus, the Wutch dialect is spoken, which also has a character of its own. Learned natives of this province too have been found in Calcutta; a translation has commenced, and a fount of types has been cut. In this dialect, the Gospel of St. Matthew is in the press. The language of the province of Sindh, the capital of which stands in the Delta, formed by the river Indus, differs somewhat from this; but the character is nearly the same. In this too a version of the New Testament is begun.

13. The *Bullochee*.—On the west bank of the Indus is the Bullochee country, of which an account was given in our last report. In this language, the progress in printing has been slow; but the Gospel by St. Matthew is printed off, and St. Mark is in the press.

14. The *Pushtoo*.—The Pushtoo Language follows, or that of the Afghans, possibly descended from the Ten Tribes. In this language the New Testament is translated, and the three first books of the Pentateuch. The Gospel of St. Matthew is printed off, and St. Mark begun. We proceed to the north-west.

15. The *Punjabee*.—Northward, within the Indus, we come to the Punjabee language, or that of the Shikhs. In this language it is with pleasure we add, that the New Testament is printed off within a chapter or two; which version makes the *sixth*, in which we have been enabled to complete the New Testament. The Pentateuch is nearly translated.

16. The *Kashmeer*.—To the north of the Shikhs, lies the province of Kashmeer, in the language of which the translation of the New Testament is now finished; but the progress made in printing has been small: the Gospel by St. Matthew is, however, nearly printed

off. It has been already said, that this language has a beautiful character of its own.

17. *The Nepaul.*—Proceeding eastward from the *Punjab*, we come to the kingdom of *Nepaul*, on the north-east of *Hindoostan*. In the language of this kingdom a translation has been begun nearly two years. The four Gospels are nearly finished, and that of St. Matthew in the press. It has a very close affinity with the *Hiudee*; and the character is the *Deva-Naguree*.

18. *The Assam.*—To the north-east of *Nepaul* we have the kingdom of *Assam*, in the language of which a translation has been going forward for some years. The whole of the New Testament is translated, and the Pentateuch nearly finished. The Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark are printed off, and that of St. Luke is in the press.

19. *The Kassai.*—Still more eastward, and within a hundred leagues of *China*, is the *Kassai* Nation, a race of whose honesty and fair dealing *English* gentlemen who have resided near them give a pleasant account. These mountaineers, who have a constant intercourse with the people of *Sylhet*, have no character of their own; nor, strictly speaking, a written language. The few among them who can write, use the *Bengalee* character. The language has a much greater affinity with the *Chinese*, however, than with the *Bengalee*, which may be inferred even from their personal pronouns. In the language of these mountaineers a translation has been begun, which is advanced to the Gospel of St. John; and St. Matthew is in the press, in the *Bengalee* character.

20. *The Burman.*—To the south-east of the *Kassai* mountains we come to the *Burman* empire; from which country, since we have sent a press thither, we have not particularly heard respecting the progress of the translation. The press has, we believe, been ordered up to *Ava*, the seat of government, together with Mr. F. Carey.

21. *The Chinese.*—This language terminates our work of translation eastward, respecting which the various leadings of Divine Providence in furnishing and continuing to us the means, till the translation of the New Testament is finished, together with that of the Old as far as the middle of the Book of Psalms, and founts of types prepared to print them both, seems proportioned to the importance of the object. We have put the Pentateuch to press in a new fount of *Chinese* types, in which we shall be able to carry it forward, while we are completing that of the New Testament in the former types, as three or four of the epistles are already through the press. In printing *Chinese* with moveable types, an edition proceeds slowly at the beginning, as the number required for the first few forms is very great, particularly in such a work as the Old Testament. The first twenty chapters of *Genesis* contain most of the names which occur in the Pentateuch: hence

	I,	Thou,	He.
BENGALEE,	<i>Amme,</i>	<i>Toomee,</i>	<i>Tinnce.</i>
CHINESE,	<i>Ngo,</i>	<i>Nee,</i>	<i>Tha.</i>
KASSAI,	<i>Nga,</i>	<i>Fee,</i>	<i>Tu.</i>

these chapters have occupied the better part of the year in preparing the requisite types. This delay in the beginning is, however, amply compensated by the ease and speed with which the latter part of the version, and indeed successive and improved editions, can be completed with the same types. In proceeding with these types, we have ascertained, that the use of a press, and the cheapness of labor in Bengal, which has enabled us to furnish the Hindee New Testament of more than six hundred pages octavo for a rupee, will enable us to print editions of the Chinese Scripture, containing any number of copies, at less than half the expense of printing in China. This will not be matter of wonder to those who consider that provisions, which regulate the price of manual labor, can be obtained in Bengal for little more than a third of the price they bear in China.

On reviewing these languages, we shall perceive that of those which have been more recently entered upon, the *Oodyapore*, the *Joyppore*, and indeed the *Nepaul*, are varieties of the Hindee; that the *Kachkon* is a variety of the Mahratta; and that the *Kassai* has a strong affinity with the Chinese. Nearly all the languages in which we are engaged may therefore be traced to two great sources, the Sanskrit and the Chinese, to which they approximate in various degrees. To the cultivation of these two, our attention is directed.

Histoire Abrégée de la Littérature Romaine, par F. Schoell, conseiller de cour de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, &c. 4 vol. 8vo. Paris, 1815.

Essai sur les Mystères d'Eleusis. 2d. ed. St. Petersburg, 1815. (par M. Ouvaroff.)

IN THE PRESS.

Mr. DYER, the author of the 'History of the University and Colleges of Cambridge,' has in the Press, a work entitled "The Privileges of the University of Cambridge," containing a chronological table of all its charters, with their titles, from the earliest to more modern times, arranged in exact order, according to the Christian era, and the kings of England; together with a series of the principal charters themselves, and the statutes of Queen Elizabeth. It will be also accompanied with other public instruments and documents; being intended to serve as Fasti to the History of Cambridge. To the end will be subjoined various additions and emendations to Mr. Dyer's own History of the University and Colleges. The greater part of the work will be in Latin: to the Latin part will be prefixed a Latin Dissertation, addressed 'Viris Academicis;' to the English, will be subjoined an English Dissertation on the contents of the whole volume. The work, we understand, is nearly all printed, but not to be published till the winter. It will be published by Subscription.

M. Thieban de BERNEAUD intends to publish an edition of all the works of Theophrastus, including all the fragments of his
NO. XXIII. Cl. JI. VOL. XII. Q

author, dispersed in the whole circuit of classic literature. It will be preceded by an introduction, containing the Life of Theophrastus, and a critical estimate of his works, besides an account of all the extant MSS. of his works, and an enumeration of all the editions and translations of Theophrastus, since the fifteenth century.

We understand that a son of a very celebrated engraver is attempting to unfold, under the directions of the Rev. JOHN HARTER, F. A. S. one of the six Herculaneum MSS. presented by his Sicilian Majesty to the Prince Regent. We believe this MS. to have been previously attempted by Dr. YOUNG.

A Selection of *Æsop's Fables*, with English Notes and Questions, for Schools.

Œdipi Metamorphoses Selectæ, et in usum Scholarum expurgatæ, cum Notis Anglicis. By the Rev. C. Bradley.

New Edition of Mr. Jones's *Latin Grammar*.

JUST PUBLISHED.

A Neat Edition of the *Greek Testament*. The text is taken from the edition now publishing by the Rev. E. Valpy. It is printed in duodecimo, for the use of Schools.

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Officiis, Libri Tres; juxta editionem J. M. et J. Frid. Heusingerorum. Accedunt, in gratiam juventutis, notæ quædam Anglice scriptæ. Pr. 6s. boards.

Diatessaron, seu Integra Historia Domini nostri J. C. Latine ex quatuor Evangeliiis inter se collatis; ipsisque Evangelistarum verbis apte et ordinate dispositis confecta. E Versione præcipue Castellionis castigata et emendata. Cui præfiguntur Tabula Palæstinæ Geographica, necnon Ordo Rerum. Opera et studio T. Thirlwall, A. M. Edit. sec. Pr. 4s. 6d.

An Introduction to the Greek Language; containing the most useful rules of Syntax, and a new set of Exercises, on an improved plan. By the Rev. Mr. Picquot. Pr. 3s.

Elements of Latin Prosody, with Exercises and Questions, designed as an Introduction to the scanning and making Latin Verses. By the Rev. C. Bradley. 4s. bound. A Key may be had by private application. Pr. 2s. 6d.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Dissertation on the *Origin of the Abyssinians* has not yet been received by us. We hope the author will make further inquiries on the subject.

Remarks on 1 Tim. iii. 16. will shortly appear.

Loci quidam Luciani emendati, &c. will be continued in next.

A Notice of *Rich's Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon* in our next.

Professor Browu's *Latin Prize Essays* will appear future Nos.

M.'s valuable articles will shortly appear.

Abbé Morso's *Chart of Arabic Grammar* will certainly appear in No. XXIV. We are sorry to disappoint TYRO, but if he would call on the Printer, a satisfactory reason for the delay would be offered to him.

A French writer of the 17th century seriously advises authors not to send well-written copies to the printer; for he says that in that case the work will be given to a young apprentice, and be full of errors; but if the copy be badly written, it will be put in the hands of a correct compositor. We presume that T. P. has had this advice in view.

A *Friend to Consistency* informs us that "a critic who sarcastically reproved us for once printing Mytilene for Mitylene, has since adopted the former spelling." We had observed the reproof, but not the recantation; we hope that the latter was as candid, as the former was severe.

The critical notice of Smith's *Greek Translation of Jewell's Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, lately republished by Mr. Campbell of Pontefract, was too late for our present number. It shall be inserted in our next.

We are much obliged for the loan of Burton's tract *Pers. Ling. Hist. &c.*, of which we shall make use in a future No.

We are sorry that an accident has deprived our readers of No. III. *On Greek and Latin Accents* in this Number. It shall certainly appear in the next.

The same observation applies to the Notes on Plats.

1. Ave.
2. Do—mus.
3. S—omnia.
4. Maro. Roma.
5. N—omen.
6. Mus—ca—tum.
7. Silex—ilex—lex—ca—x—sile.

END OF NO. XXIII.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

CHEAPEST HEBREW BIBLE,
GERMAN EDITION.

T. BOOSEY, 4, BROAD-STREET, EXCHANGE,

Respectfully informs Biblical Students, School-masters, Oriental Scholars, and the Literary World in general, that he has just imported a number of HEBREW BIBLES, edited by REINECCIUS, DOERDERLEIN, and MEISNER, with very extensive Readings, Collations, and Masoretic Notes, &c. by KENNICOTT and DE ROSSI, forming Two Volumes, 8vo. with Points, Accents, &c. on very good Paper, and at the moderate Price of 16s ; a price so reasonable, it is to be hoped, will meet the attention of Oriental Scholars, &c. who have been prevented from purchasing by the exorbitant prices they are charged in England.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N^o. XXIV.

DECEMBER, 1815.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

YOUR correspondent M. in *Vol. x. p. 268.* has noticed, what he thinks, an error, in my article, *Vol. viii. p. 377.* viz. "In the ninth century—Jerome began to mend the first Latin translation by the Hebrew," and he asks, "are we to believe him right when he tells us that Jerome did not live until the ninth century?" Were I disposed to cavil, I might ask what *ninth century* does this gentleman mean? it was certainly in a *ninth century* that Jerome began to correct the first Latin translation. If your correspondent will read, after the words, '*in the ninth century,*'—the words, '*after the captivity,*' which were accidentally omitted in the second MS. for the press, he will find I was right; viz. *In the ninth century after the captivity Jerome began,* &c. Jerome was born A. D. 329, and the Hebrews returned from the captivity 536 years before Christ, which was in the ninth century *after the captivity.*

Your learned correspondent R. M. C. also makes a remark *Vol. x. p. 335.* concerning the word ELOHIM in my *History of all Religions, second edition*; he is also pleased to give this work a very high character; he says—"a work which undoubtedly does the author the highest credit, equally as the Gentleman, the Biblical Scholar, the Orthodox Theologist, and the Genuine Christian." I have not the pleasure of being personally known to this writer. With regard to my orthodoxy, I was brought up in the established church. I believe her doctrines to be perfectly consistent with the sacred scriptures; and if I have any claim to the character of "genuine Christian," I believe with the church that it is not on the ground of my own merit.

NO. XXIV.

Cl. II.

VOL. XII.

R

If this gentleman be not already satisfied with what has been said in proof that אֱלֹהִים is a *noun singular*, comprehending the *Divine Trinity in Unity*, perfectly conformable to that admirable definition of the belief of the apostolic churches, which we call the ATHANASIAN CREED: I hope he will be, when he reads the note on Gen. i. 1. which will appear in my new translation of the book of Genesis, as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers (who are already of the most respectable and learned class) enable me to go to press.

He expresses surprise, "that אֱלֹהִים should be still conceived of the *singular number*, by Mr. Bellamy, contrary to the now generally received opinion of every biblical student." To assume the point in dispute is an easy way of settling it, and therefore he adds, "as this can therefore be *no longer considered as a controverted point*, to attempt to go over the ground again, with the abundant proofs that may be deduced from the sacred volume, and which is already done by the many able writers of the present day, particularly by the author of the *Commentaries and critical Notes on the Holy Scriptures*, could manifestly add no farther weight to the *now decided* argument respecting the plurality of the word ELOHIM." The proofs adduced by "*the author*," to whom he alludes, Dr. A. Clarke, have been laid before your readers, and have been objected to in your pages; nor have the objections been yet answered. They may also be further seen at large in the OPHION, a work I lately published.

R. M. C. having begged the question, would have done well, if he had abstained from all farther remark; but he enters the field of controversy with an argument highly injurious to the cause which he attempts to advocate. "No classical reader," he observes, "needs to be reminded, that nothing is more frequently to be met with, than grammatical anomalies respecting the agreement and the government of words. The Arabic, the Hebrew, with all their dependent tongues, abound with them. Hence we find singular nouns connected with plural verbs, and plural nouns with singular verbs." If so, what becomes of the argument drawn by Hutchinson, Parkhurst, Hailes, and Dr. A. Clarke, from a few passages, which they have supposed so connected, when, in every other instance throughout the scriptures, that word is found joined with *nouns, adjectives, and verbs*, singular? As to his quotations from common Hebrew Grammars, they may prove satisfactory to some, but they are not consistent with the genius, phraseology and grammar of the sacred language. By the word *anomaly*, as applied by your learned correspondent, I cannot allow that it will authorise him to *consider*, that a noun plural may be connected with a verb singular, or vice versa; in such case, the word "grammatical" would be very improper; for throughout the

scripture, and in all languages, such kind of "anomaly," as this writer means, cannot be understood. By *anomaly*, I understand a deviation from rule; but there is no rule to be found in Scripture, that will authorise us to deviate from good sense; which would necessarily be the case, if such kind of anomaly were admitted.

J. BELLAMY.

North Place, Gray's Inn Lane.

NOTICE OF

UTRIUSQUE LEONIDÆ CARMINA. *Cum Argumentis, varietate lectionis, scholiis, et commentario, edidit et indice ornavit* ALBERT. CHRIST. MEINEKE, *apud Sussenses Rector*. Lips. in libr. Weidmannia. small 8vo.

THIS is a very useful edition of two very middling writers, Leonidas Tarentinus, and Leonidas Alexandrinus. Meineke, a scholar of some reputation in Germany, undertook the edition for a double reason: to collect into one volume the principal researches which different critics had made on his authors; and to assist such young men as might be inclined to form an acquaintance with them. The text is that of Brunck, with a few differences, some readings, which he afterwards proposed, having in this edition been received into the text. Some of the notes exhibit various readings, collected from different editions: others are explanatory, in which parallel passages from other writers are adduced, and the senses of unusual words investigated. For this reason it may be of some use to the editors of the new edition of Stephens' Thesaurus.—Upon the whole, to such as turn their thoughts towards the illustration of the writers of the Anthology, the book will be of considerable use: as it is frequently necessary, in order to understand the best writers of Epigrams, to read with attention the worst. We do not indeed rank either of our authors in the latter class: to those who wish to read pretty conceits on love and wine; or to learn all the various *formulae* by which superannuated heroes, or decayed rakes, in days of yore dedicated themselves to the innumerable inhabitants of the celestial Billingsgate, Olympus, this volume may be a very agreeable companion. In reading it, they will be much better employed than in perusing similar *jeux d'esprit* of the present day.

NOTICE OF

'*A GENERAL INTRODUCTION to the Study of the HEBREW SCRIPTURES, with a Critical History of the Greek and Latin Versions, of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and of the Chaldee Paraphrases. By the Rev. G. HAMILTON, Rector of Killermogh.*" Dublin, 8vo. pp. 197. 1813.

WHY will not these *Historiæ Criticæ Scriptores* first read the latest and best writers on the subject of which they treat? and if the proper books are either inaccessible to them, or unintelligible, because written in languages which they do not understand, why will they write at all? These questions have been suggested to us by the perusal of Mr. Hamilton's work. We have not, indeed, much reason to complain of faults of commission: for what he has done, he has done well: but we must be permitted to say, that he has omitted a great deal, of which he ought to have been particular in treating. The author has, it is true, acted up to what he promised in his Title Page; but there he did not take in a sufficiently wide range. Of the Peshito, or Syriac Version, he has not said a word: yet this version is decidedly one of the most valuable, and he has promised (Preface, p. vi.) to "give in a form, calculated for general circulation, satisfactory information on some subjects connected with the study of the Hebrew Bible, and of the *best known of its ancient versions.*" This defect is more inexcusable because much information respecting it is contained in books written in Latin, namely in Walton's *Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta*, in Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, and in Dathe's Preface to his edition of the Syriac Psalter (8vo. Halæ Sax. 1768). In the same manner he has omitted the Arabic Version, though it has been treated of in Latin works innumerable: neither has he even so much as hinted the existence of an Æthiopic or Egyptian version, though Ludolf has treated of the first in his *Historia Æthiopica*, Francf. 1699. and Woide has excellently described the latter in his *Dissertatio de Bibliorum versione Ægyptiaca*, Oxon. 1799.

Another great defect is, his apparent ignorance of the German language, which to a Biblical Critic is almost essential, on account of the numerous discoveries which have lately been made in Germany, and which are recorded in the *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek* of Michaelis, in *Eichhorn's Repertorium für Biblischen und Morgenländischen Literatur*, and his *Allge-*

meine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur, and other periodical works of the same description; not to mention the innumerable valuable commentaries and other works of the German critics; from not having read these, Mr. H. is nearly a century behind hand, in his information.

From Eichhorn's *Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, most important information might have been given; but Mr. H. does not appear to know that such a book even exists. His work, therefore, is decidedly inferior, even to a small octavo volume published many years ago by Dr. Bauer, as a guide to his *Academical Lectures*.¹ Mr. Hamilton, however, if he will attend to German Literature, may raise a very useful superstructure upon the foundation he has laid in his present work: we have already said, that what he has done, he appears to have done well, and we have complained, not of his prolixity, but of his conciseness. But imperfect and unsatisfactory as his book is, we hail it with considerable pleasure, as affording some beginning of critical literature in a country, which has been hitherto, of all others, Spain and Portugal excepted, the most unprolific.

ORATIO

Habita Cantabrigiæ in Sacello Collegioque S. S. et Individuæ Trinitatis Solenni festoque die Fundatoris memoriæ sacro, octavo kalendas Junii MDCCLV. Ex Testamento optimi nuper viri JOH. WILSONI, S. T. P. Perorante GUL. MASKELYNE, A. M. Ejusdem Collegii Socio.

LÆTITIAQUE concursusque vester, Academici, atque hujusce diei sollemnitas, ipsius insuper loci religio, cujus celebrandi gratia huc convenimus, maxima inter mortales beneficia recensenti mihi summum in hac re studium vestrum et benevolentiam cum silentio pollicentur. Quanquam autem perspectum habeam pro virtute ac nominis eorum gloria, qui a principio has Musarum ædes condiderunt, vel deinceps aliquo ornamento adauxerunt, dignam satis orationem vix inveniri quidem posse, qualibus tamen cunq̃ue viribus aggrendum est: ne parum honestum sit nobis eos, quorum

¹ Entwurf einer Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments. (*Sketch of an Introduction to the Scriptures of the Old Testament*,) 8vo. Nürnberg und Altdorf. 1794.

opera docti atque edocti sumus probe, quia perfecta erant ipsi pietate, ideo ne minores quidem consecutos esse laudes.

Quis autem melius optimorum virorum laudes concinet, quam qui facta enarraverit? cujus item hominis majus unquam in nos beneficium extitit, aut prius antiquiusve, quam Hervici Stanton, Suffolciensis? qui jam inde ab Edvardi secundi regis temporibus privatis opibus vere magnificum ausus opus sanctam Michaelis, id nomen erat, domum ex adverso in latere australi Musis feliciter posuit. Sic deinde ex mente ipsius positam, nequid tanto numeri deesset, iis annuis redditibus firmavit ac locupletavit, quibus vel adhuc gloriari nobis jure maximo licet. Is tum ibi vir bonus pulcherrimo facto suo gaudebat intuens, nescius sane quanta mox incrementa secum esset allatura dies; cui tum urbi, ut ita dicam, lapidem angularem ipse manu sua fundasset, ac primas tantum lineas designasset.

Nec longo deinde annorum intervallo consimili flagrans literarum bonarum atque artium amore Edvardus tertius rex aulam hic regiam, ab ipsius fundatore sic vocitatum, turre illa sua observabilem, faustis magis dicam auspiciis, an secundo rerum exitu, an pio magis consilio construebat? Jam tum inimica gens Gallia regis illius, illius inquam nostri sapientiam, atque animi magnitudinem perspicientes superbiam suam melius deposuissent: cum jamdudum non dubiis signis, nisi eorum mentes obceccasset Deus, præ sagire poterant qui motus animorum, quæ ipsorum fuga, quæ strages, siquando in Pictavinum campum descenderet, essent futurae. Quinimo plane furere, quando in lubitum fuerit, iis hostibus suo semper cum periculo sinimus: nos vero ad propositum institutum revertamur.

Hic tamen, quantumvis arctati simus temporis angustiis, pium, probum virum, atque huic loco et his studiis benevolentissimum Henricum sextum regem præterire esset nefas. Qui cum istis fundamentis, quæ rex ille dudum hostium victor, proavus autem suus Edvardus jecerat, impensius faveret, aquam aliam fistulis subter alveum fluminis salubriorem ex longinquo deducebat. Quæ res, quanto sit ornameto, videtis: quam ad multa sit perutilis, citius ex aliorum inopia, quam ex vestra maxima illa copia colligetis.

Proximus deinde Edvardus quartus rerum omnium, parta victoria, potens nihil horum permutari, nihil sua sede moveri, per eas denique literas, quæ patentes vocantur, nihil non ratum confirmatumque esse voluit. Ita dissidentes inter se Eboracensis domus et Lancastriæ principes hic saltem omnes honeste certaverunt, uter utri benefaciendo sit prior.

Huc addamus, minorum quamvis gentium munera, non aspernenda vicina illa quidem hospitia Margaretana, Fesviciana, Osethana, Jaretana. Quæ cum nullis essent opibus, nullis legibus, nondum certo aliquo doctrinæ investigandæ duce, morum itidem

nullo censore uterentur, hoc tantum præ se ferebant, huic unico commodò inserviebant, studiosis omnibus tectum, larem, perfugium interim dando, commune quoddam sese quasi asyllum literarum aperuisse.

Jamque pro ea, qua semper fuit, animi majestate Henricus octavus rex, fundator, pater nostrum omnium, rem magnam ausus novo prorsus consilio has senas ædes omnes conjungendi, dein sub uno eodemque magistro in perpetuum ævum stabiliendi, ne sit alicubi in terris florentior Musarum sedes; (absit tantis dictis invidia, dum vera tota mente proferam, quodque alienis meritis testimonium redderem, in eo cives non defraudem meos), hoc, inquam præclaro consilio usus, ut ex immenso illo Chao ordinem quendam, usum, lucem, gratiam ac dignitatem explicaret, intermedia omnia ædificia disjecit; quæ minus decora officiebant oculis, aut huic formæ, quam pulcherrimam intuemini, inservire ullo modo negabant, sustulit; reliqua hæc mira arte ac diligentia consarciebat; monachorum, pessimæ gregis hominum, quos ille suis sedibus exules egerat, præda atque opimis spoliis ditabat; magistrum deinde præposuit. Sic demum universa illa materia in unum quodammodo corpus redacta, ita ut nihil truncum atque informe, aut etiam quovis loco deficere videretur, nihil rursus abundaret, una identidem anima, unus sensus, eadem cogitatio prorsus inesse omnibus videbatur. Quod quidem opus omnibus suis numeris absolutum, perfectumque videns ille ipse qui condiderat artifex, nequid religionis aut ominis boni deesse videretur, bona, felicia, fausta que omnia precatus hanc ædem suam Deo propriam fieri, ejus numine semper atque imperio regi, sacrosanctæ et individuae Trinitati sacram esse voluit, inde ei nomen dedit. Cujus autem beneficii gratiam et commune commodum ad vos omnes, Academici, pertinere sæpius intellexistis, Henricus noster, quod bono esset publico, tres illos lectores constituit, qui de Deo rebusque divinis, qui Græce, qui Hebræice optimorum ac juratorum insuper septemvirorum judicio plurimum callerent. Qua tamen ratione dignitatis exinde aliquid huic collegio suo accederet, hic locum, tectum dedit; mensam iis viris apposuit; societatem, siquando velint, addidit; ex hoc potissimum tot florentium virorum numero deligi voluit.

Quid? ipsius postea conditoris filius Edvardus sextus rex quo erga nos animo in diem futurus videbatur, cum vel in ipso brevissimæ vitæ cursu patris ea benefacta rata nobis fecerit, et certissima manu sua confirmaverit? Quid? altera deinde soboles Maria regina, cum inter alia munera hujusce sacelli fundamenta poneret, cujus tandem pietatis esse videbatur? quod fenestras jam tenus eductum, ne sola eadem ad summum fastigium perduceret, mors fuit impedimento.

Quid? illa etiam altera, Henrice, stirpis tuæ gloria, filia Elisa regina qualis erat nutrix faultrixque horum omnium, condita autem

schola Westmonasteriensi, mater mea alma, pia, felix, numquid hoc sermone meo attigisse satis sit? num, festinante me quidem ad tuas iterum laudes repetendas, hoc tantillulum sibi habeat præconium? numquid hanc nomine tantum salutatam sic dimittamus? idque audire modo tibi, pater, tuoque huic populo in præsens sufficiat? an omni potius contentione virium hoc loco sapientem principem celebramus? Quæ cum patriis virtutibus olim res publicas administraret, ac forti supra fœminas animo teterrimam illam tempestatem Hispanicam his oris avertisset, colonias Americanas commercii causa, et in his unicam præcipuam eam, quam nunc Galli suis injuriis creptum eunt, Virginiam condidisset, hostes ubique terra marique perdomuisset, pacis perinde artibus idonea nequaquam minorem laborantis tum religionis ac doctrinæ rationem secum interim instituerat. Cujus tam doctæ olim patronæ desiderio pios multos literatosque viros etiamnum teneri censeo. Quæ singulari quodam consilio ab utriusque Academiæ Cancellariis sciscitabatur, increpationibus interdum minisque flagitabat, "quoniam in his ædibus cum singulis tum universis, quam in re, quantumque cernerent: id certiores eam facerent, planeque edocerent:" hac mente scilicet, ne cuiuspiam latere ingenium posset regiis negotiis suo mox tempore præficiendum. Quod ad nos attinet maxime pro ea, qua singulari fuit, prudentia annuos hujusce collegii redditus, cum vilior indies fieret pecunia, præfinitis frumentorum modiis solvi statuto publico jussit. Ad hæc collegium divi Petri apud Westmonasterienses scholamque celeberrimam illam quidem, et totius Britannicæ longe maximam, quam rem præteriens acu modo quasi tetigeram, in usum literarum elegantiorum Elisa regina condidit: unde discipuli quotannis in utramque pariter Academiam eligantur, et in hanc ædem nostram, quasi fonte quodam perenni, feliciter deducantur. Prima quoque legibus ac statutis hanc domum fundavit, quibus deinceps oraculo tanquam Pythio comprobatis obtemperandum est. Hancine vero tantam, ita me Dei filius amet, tam divitem hodie patriam, haberemus, tam omnibus copiis navalibus instructam, literis excultam, vera atque unica religione gaudentem, nisi ea omnia in ipsis pæne primordiis interitura hæc Dæx propior quam fœminis regina conservasset, atque insuper a tantæ calamitatis metu in pœterum vindicasset.

Vos quoque piæ animæ, qui aliquam domus hujusce nostræ partem opibus vestris illustrastis, universos simul jubeo salvere, valere: cum omnes sane longo ordine commemorare esset infinitum. Vestra, vestra inquam pietate, quod hos omnes licet attestari, et ea tot beneficiorum copia, velut rore matutino, non singulam tantum artem scientiamve irrigastis, sed totum quantus est disciplinarum campum recreastis atque refecistis.

Atque eccam bibliothecam, quanta sit, nostram! qualis autem quotidiano usu plerique pernovistis: quod insigne pietatis et mu-

nificentiae monumentum ex privatorum donis conflatum est. Hic coemptos undique nobiles libros consulere est: hic poetarum chorum optimum, hic mathematicorum universam suppellectilem, hic Socraticam domum, hic omnigenae scientiae monumenta, quae vel antiquissima manu scripta inveniantur, vel arte feliciore quotidie imprimuntur. Hinc siqua olim veteribus scriptis exciderunt minus indies desiderantur: quorum tantis nos ipsi naufragiis ditamur; quanta stante adhuc et florente Graecia, atque incolume urbe Roma, ne per longa quidem saecula in terrarum orbis ultimam tum hanc insulam fors ulla devexisset: nunc autem toto aequore jactatos nec opinantibus nobis Deus, ille adeo, qui tempestatem eam certe excitaverat, his oris atque his maxime hospitibus appulit Deus. Hinc solida veritate pascitur mens humana, adornatur, locupletatur: ut incredibile nobis prorsus videatur tantum malorum omnium diluvium aliquando extitisse, quantum represserit, atque revera hic quoque doctrina quotidie reprimat. Quare nequis in os mihi doctrinam inter privatos cujusque parietes invenendam laudare amplius audeat: neu sobrius vitam fere totam ibi actam tractatamque leniter narret: multo minus alienas longe petendas esse disciplinas suadeat: aut insanas et nimium diu jam deridiculas hasce puero- rum nostrorum peregrinationes alicui in animum inducat. Cum iidem perfodere montes, sistere fluminum cursus, et in hortulum suum derivare magno mehercle conamine, sed infelice plerumque exitu moliri prorsus videantur. Quanto satius est nobis in ipsa ripa fluminis sedem posuisse, labores, studia, mores tot hominum perspexisse, literarum quoddam inter nos quasi commercium instituisse.

Quae enim urbs, quae gens antea unquam in terris, quae dicam natio, cum rudes adhuc artium essent homines, et dextro Mercurio maxime indigerent, totidem literarum miracula vaticinata est, suo deinde tempore protulit, patefecit, perfecit, quot et quanta ex aede unica hac nostra provenerunt in commune commodum, atque humani generis decus? Quid vero, Academici, dignum vestris auribus, aut iis operibus immortalibus, aut eorum virtuti sempiternae par ullo modo protuli, aut fortasse prolaturus videor? contentus poene tantummodo nominasse hos viros, cum adaequandae laudum eorum majestatis spes omnes abjecissem. Baconos scilicet, Newtonos, Cotesios, Smithios; Drydenos insuper, Couleios, Barovios; sacerdotes castos, pios vates, philosophos autem poene divinos, quos ipse aliquando consortio suo proprio dignabitur Deus.

Natura sine disciplina caeca est, et vi ruit sua: illa contra, si a natura destituatur, manca est et deficit: utraque ubi, dante ac volente Deo, convenerunt, exercitatione tamen opus est et certaminum studio. Ne ipsa quidem Graecia, mihi credite, artibus a Deo armisque abundasset, nisi Lycæa, porticus, sylvas Academiae seposuissent: nisi gymnicos praeterea ludos, palaestras, circus, theatra

nobili quodam studio frequentassent : agone demum illo Olympico præmia omnibus, justos simul juratos sanctosque judices proposuissent.

Vos tamen fortunatos ! si vestra satis nostis ea bona, quos Musæ severiores secernunt populo : quibus doctarum illæ indies præmia frontium novas aliquas palmas decernunt : quorum gravissimis dictis ac factis Pythagoræ disciplinæ ritu cum silentio stupemus. Utque Cereris aliquando olim arcanis initiati beati dehinc credebantur, vos perinde quietis his ordinibus adscripti de vitæ exitu, et universo ævo spem habetis conceptam meliorem : tantoque rectius doctrinæ illius, quam Neutonus noster toto terrarum orbe disseminavit, fruges ac primitias vos auferetis, qualia Atheniensibus quondam persolvebantur, quanto mentem humanam coluisse pluris est, quam terram inventis plaustis renovasse. Vile solum est Attica : Tibridis arenis prope occlusum est ostium : ipsaque Ægypti Alexandria tot quondam scientiis librisque suis superba, iis omnibus exhausta penitus, iucensaque hostiliter, jam inter cineres illas sedens tacita quodammodo vestram opem reposcere videatur : sicut, Nilo jampridem alveo suo egredi nolente, aut aquas illas debitas solito hæsitantius ac pedetentim quidem educente, illa ipsa supplex hæc vestra Ægyptus sole usta tum atque arida Trajanum imperatorem fruges suas reposcebat : Gallia suam sero palmam tradidit : Carthesianum illud somnium evanuit : et in hoc perventum est fastigium, ut¹ non nisi cum mundo interiturus sit Neutonus.

Quem vero finem jam faciam ? aut quis astantium, ut Graccho olim Romano, ita meæ nunc voci in his rebus statuet modum ? quis aliquem mihi suggeret exitum ? Bene itaque suo præteritum loco, quo pia sit ac perpetua beneficiorum memoria, et mentibus vestris inhæreat, atque exempro prosit, Henrici præconium repetatur. Quid simile, quid secundum huic tanto, tam pulcre pieque collocato beneficio inveniemus ? aut quemnam mortalium Henrico nostro vel sapientia, vel fortitudine, vel munificentia nisi ex longo intervallo proximum reperiemus ? Unicum post hominum memoriam, magni scilicet sapientisque viri Thesei consilium vel ipsius rei nobilitate, vel utilitate cum hoc nostro conferri quodammodo videatur. Qui, consimili olim ratione inita, civitatem Atticam, qui prius sparsim et vicatim habitabant, compulit in unum locum, et congregavit. Quid vero ? cum adunatis totius gentis opibus, viribus, consiliis plurimum quidem patriam suam amplificasset, ipsius quomodo capiti et fortunis consultum est ? Cum Athenarum arcem celeberrimam peregre inde in exilium abiens, et superba illa mœnia sua opera constructa, et ingratham civitatem brevique ruituram respiciens precibus, et diris, execrationibusque in perpetuum devoveret.

¹ Non nisi cum toto debuit orbe mori. Hug. Grot. de Erasmo. Ed.

Agite vero ad lætiora illa nostra revertamur, gratias, et gratulationes, et pias beneficiorum commemorationes, et festos dies institutos, et cœtus hominum celeberrimos, et commune omnium gaudium. Quum stare hanc domum præclaram, tot linguis, artibus, scientiisque ornatam, opibus deinde amplificatam, fama auctam, et novo jam quasi fundamine cœptam iterum strui videant; cum probam docilemque juventutem esse audiant, sapientes senes, et, quod huic tanto populo est instar omnium, magistrum certe in quolibet laudum genere præstantissimum, quidni maximam olim in terris huic ædi diuturnitatem non vanis auguriis, minimeque dubiis tot signorum interpretationibus polliceantur?

Neu quis humanis opibus provenire tot ac tanta hæc arbitretur, Dei, Dei inquam ductu atque auspiciis jacta sunt fundamenta, aucta, perfectaque omnia. Hinc omne principium, huc prosperi referendi sunt exitus.' Unus igitur qui ab initio condidit hanc ædem, qui sacrosanctæ et individuae Trinitatis ei nomen impertivit, conditam imperio suo semper regat Deus.

REMARKS

On 1 Tim. III. 16.

As I live in a remote corner of the country, and have not an opportunity of seeing many new books, I had not till lately the pleasure of perusing some volumes of the *Classical Journal*. I am greatly pleased both with the general plan, and with many particular papers in that work; and it would give me much satisfaction if I could, in any way, add to its value. With this hope, I send you the following remarks on 1 Tim. III. 16, $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (or, according to others $\delta\varsigma$ or $\hat{\omicron}$) $\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\ \epsilon\nu\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$.

This passage (with the exception of the three heavenly witnesses, 1 John v. 7) has been the subject of more discussion than any other in the New Testament; nor can it, like this latter, be regarded as fully settled to the conviction of Biblical critics. Of the two great editors, Wetstein and Griesbach (both of whom agree in rejecting the common reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) the one wishes to substitute $\delta\varsigma$, the other $\hat{\omicron}$, the first of which appears to have been the reading of the Alexandrian, the other of the Western Recension. That $\delta\varsigma$ is the most probable of all the readings, is evident from the margin of Griesbach's edition, where it appears that it is supported (1) by the most ancient manuscripts, (2) by the most ancient versions,

¹ Hinc omne principium; huc refer exitum.—Hor. Ed.

² Is not the doubtful reading, $\delta\varsigma$ or $\hat{\omicron}$, some proof in favor of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$? EDIT.

(§) that the ancient *Fathers* could not have read $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, as their reasoning, and even their very silence (in those controversies concerning the divinity of Christ, where the common reading would have been expressly to their purpose) strongly militates against such a notion. But, though $\delta\varsigma$ is, beyond all doubt, the best supported of the three readings, it appears, according to the usual way in which the verse is read, to make something very like nonsense; and Griesbach himself says, *Lectio hæc difficilior est et insolentior ceteris*. Accordingly, the opponents of the reading $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Erasmus, Grotius, and Sir Isaac Newton) have, as appears from Wetstein, embraced the reading δ or *quod*, in which they have been joined by that great critic himself. This they have been probably induced to do from the difficulty of making sense of $\delta\epsilon$, which they ought, in consistency with the canons of criticism, to have adopted, and which has accordingly been adopted into his text by Griesbach.

In a perusal of this epistle some time ago, without any particular view to this discussion, and in a Greek Testament without notes, or various readings, it occurred to me that the difficulty of this whole passage consists in the word $\delta\mu\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\varsigma$ at the beginning of the verse. This (as the ancient MSS. were written without distinction of words) has been read as one word, $\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\gamma\omicron\tau\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$; whereas, it ought, according to my conjecture, to be resolved into four, $\omicron\mu\omicron\tau$, and $\iota\omicron\iota\gamma\omicron\tau$, and $\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}$, and $\omicron\varsigma$, which would remove the whole difficulty. Upon turning to the place in Wetstein and Griesbach, I became convinced from the passage of *Fathers* there quoted, that this is the true reading; and I shall shortly state to you my grounds for this supposition, after a few general remarks on the Epistle itself.

The first Epistle of Timothy appears to have been principally directed against the *Therapeutæ*, a Jewish sect, concerning which volumes have been written. Since the time of Philo, who gives an account of them at considerable length, they have been supposed to have been so named from the Greek word $\theta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$, *to heal* (viz. the soul), nor does it appear that this absurd etymology has ever been disputed. They seem, however, to have been so named, not from healing or pretending to heal either soul or body, but from תורה and פִּתּוּחַ , *Thure* and *Patak*, two Hebrew words, which literally signify to *open* or *expound the Law*. In short, the *Therapeutæ* were no other than *Expositors of the Law*, and were literally the Νημοδιδάσκαλοι of Scripture. They are described by Philo as spending the whole time, from morning to evening, in the meditation and expounding of the Scriptures, where they pretended to discover a vast number of symbolical and allegorical meanings.¹

¹ See Philo $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, or Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. cap. 17. "All the interval of time," says Philo, "from sun-rise to evening they exercise

St. Paul's chief object, in this Epistle, seems to have been to caution Timothy against this class of people, who seem to have got footing at Ephesus; and indeed, as Philo tells us, were spread over the whole world, and communicated their instructions both to Greeks and Barbarians. The Apostle begins by ridiculing their absurd allegories, and states, Chap. i. 7, that they had *turned aside to vain janglings, desiring to be Νομοδιδάκται teachers of the Law* (or *Therapeutæ*) *understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.* It appears, that of these *Therapeutæ*, or expositors of the Law, some were *females*; and, accordingly, the Apostle enjoins Timothy not to permit *women* to expound or teach, Chap. ii. v. 10—15. The *Therapeutæ* were *adversaries of marriage*, and, accordingly, the Apostle mentions that the Bishop should be a *married man*, III. 2. *'They gave up all care of their families,* and he insists on the necessity of the Bishop's *ruling well his own house, and having his children in subjection with all gravity*, III. 4, 5. Similar injunctions are given to the deacons and deaconesses; and then follows the celebrated passage, *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto Thee shortly, but if I tarry long that thou mayest know, &c.* And the Apostle, after this passage, subjoins a reason for his anxiety, and the particularity of his injunctions: *For the spirit* (says he) *spcaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving.* Against all this the Apostle cautions Timothy, and (with a manifest reference to the Therapeutic old women) he tells him to *refuse profane and old wives' fables*, chap. iv. 7; and states, that so far from there being any merit in *giving up the world*, and dedicating one's self *wholly to a contemplative life*, *if any provide not for his or her own, and specially for those of his or her own kindred, that person hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel*, chap. v. 8.

Such is the Apostle's train of reasoning; and it is evident to the most careless reader, that, as it stands at present, the famous passage, *And without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness*, is totally devoid of connexion, either with what goes before or comes after it. Nor is it less evident, from the above remarks, that the

themselves in the study of the Scriptures, which they philosophize and expound allegorically. They consider the words as merely notes and marks of hidden mysteries, which are to be explained figuratively. They have also the commentaries of ancient persons who had been leaders of their sect, and who have left them many monuments of allegorical learning, which they use as archetypes, and endeavour to imitate." The *Therapeutæ* rejected marriage, but there were ancient females among them, as well as males.

Apostle, in what goes before, was speaking *not of the conduct of Timothy himself*, but of the general conduct of the *males and females* of the christian community. The passage, accordingly, I would thus read and translate: *Ταῦτά σοι γράφω, ἐλπίζων εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς σὲ τάχιον· ἐάν δὲ βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ, ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος, στύλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς Ἀληθείας, καὶ ὁμοῦ Λόγου μὲν, ὃς μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, &c. &c. λ.* *These things I write unto thee, hoping to come to thee speedily; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know what, in the house of God, ought to be the conduct of one who is a church of the living God, a pillar and support of the Truth, and also of the word [or Logos], which is the great mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh, &c.*

That this was the reading of the early *Fathers*, I shall now proceed to show, after a very few previous observations. And, first, it is to be remarked, that the whole passage is highly figurative, but is in the usual metaphorical style of St. Paul. In Ephesians, chap. ii. 22, he speaks, also, of the Christian as a *church of God*, and the same figure is employed in 1 Pet. ii. 5. It is remarkable, also, that in this, and the second Epistle to Timothy, the Apostle frequently uses the word *Λόγος* in a very ambiguous sense, so that it is sometimes difficult to know whether he employs it personally or impersonally. Thus, for example, talking of his own fetters, he says, 2 Tim. chap. ii. 9, *But the Logos of God is not bound*; and in the phrase which he so frequently repeats in this Epistle, *Ἰστοῦς ὁ Λόγος*, it is occasionally not easy to know whether he takes *Logos* in a personal sense, or not. The Apostle also uses *Ἀληθείας* in the same ambiguous sense, making it sometimes personal, as it were, (as St. John does, when he says, 1 John, chap. v. 6, *ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἡ Ἀλήθεια*), and at other times coupling it with the *Logos*, 2 Tim. ii. 15, *τὸν Λόγον τῆς Ἀληθείας*. Finally, it is not unusual with the Apostle to connect two phrases together (as in the above text) which are in some respects synonymous, as when he calls himself in this very Epistle, chap. ii. 7, a teacher of the Gentiles, *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*. I may add, that in the passage which is the subject of discussion, the Apostle, perhaps, was led to a *twofold* method of expressing himself from his having given a twofold injunction,—that is, both with regard to the conduct of *males* and the conduct of *females* in the church; and it is probable that the meaning of the text is, *But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know what ought to be the conduct of a FEMALE who is a church of the living God, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος, and of a MALE who is a pillar and support of the Truth*; and from this twofold view of the subject might arise, perhaps, the reduplication *Ἀληθείας* and *Λόγου*.

These things being premised, I shall now proceed to show that the early *Fathers* seem to have read *ὁμοῦ Λόγου μὲν ὃς* in the above

passage; and shall confine myself to the examples in Wetstein and Griesbach. I before stated, that the interpretation which I have given occurred to me without any previous notice of these passages; and, when I saw them, I could not help wondering that when so many great minds have been occupied with this verse, the simple enunciation which I have given should never have occurred.

I. "Ad Christum referri potuit," says Griesbach *in loc.* "hoc dictum a Patribus, siue ὡς legerent siue ὡς ut a Latinis factum hoc esse, jam notavimus. Hinc Christum ipsum nonnulli μυστήριον nominare solebant, et scribere potuit, v. c. Justinus ad Diognet. : ἀπέστειλε Λόγον ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ, ὃς διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεὶς ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη." The same passage is given by Wetstein, who continues thus,—

"Addit I. Millius, ex quibus manifestum est, a B. Martyre lectum θεός. Mihi aliter videtur. Si enim lectio recepta loci istius tunc observata fuisset animo Justini, quod putat Bengelius, non utique scripsisset ἀπέστειλεν, cum θεὸς ἀπεσταλμένος nusquam in scriptura sacra legatur, et vix recte, ut puto, dici possit." Wetstein argues (it is observable) on mere theological grounds, but neither he nor Griesbach seem to have had the smallest idea of Λόγος, which must have been read (and, as in the text, without the article) by Justin. II. Cyril of Alexandria (as quoted by Griesbach) *de recta fide ad Theodosium*, thus writes: τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, τοῦτο ἐστὶ Χριστὸς, ὃς ἐφανερώθη -- οἶμαι οὐχ ἕτερον τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, ἢ αὐτὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος ὃς ἐφανερώθη, &c. et ad Regin. i. τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεὶς; ἡ δὴλον ὅτι πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος. οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. III. Gregor. Nyssen. in Antirrhet. adv. Apollinar. quoted also by Griesbach, writes thus, τὸ μυστήριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφανερώθη· καλῶς τοῦτο λέγων· οὗτος ὁ ἡμέτερος Λόγος. IV. Origen (says Griesbach) thus writes in Rom. i. 2, interprete Rufino, Is qui Verbum caro factus apparuit positus in carne, sicut Apostolus dicit, Quia (l. qui, says Wetstein; fortasse qui, says Griesbach) manifestatus est in carne, justificatus, &c. It is not unlikely that Origen, or his interpreter, might read ἡμου Λόγου μὲν ὧς, and hence Quia instead of Qui.

From all these passages, quoted from no less than four Greek Fathers, it appears that the idea of the Λόγος was constantly suggested to them by this text; and that it must therefore probably, I might almost say necessarily, have been read by them in the manner that I have proposed. The same circumstance will account for the Western reading of ὁ, instead of ὁ. Among the Latins the word Verbum or Λόγος was neuter, and therefore they would natu-

¹ "Ceterum notatu dignum est," says Griesbach *Symbola Critica*, tom. i p. xxxv, Halæ, 1785, "in omnibus operibus Origenis Græcis oraculum hoc Paulinum nunquam laudari, si unicum locum excipias, ubi legitur, ἰησοῦς ἐν δόξῃ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι λέγεται.

ally read *Quod manifestatum est*. Hence, while δ was the *oriental* Grecian, δ was considered as the *occidental* reading, because the Latin Fathers continually wrote *Quod manifestatum est*; not that δ was in their *Greek* copies, (though this indeed is the reading of the *Codex Bezae*,) but that it was necessary to make the relative *neuter*, as both the antecedents *verbum* and *mysterium* were *neuter*.

I have thus, with all the shortness in my power, given you my reasons for the resolution of the word *Ὁμολογουμένως*. Several other arguments might be adduced, but those which I have given are of the most importance; nor, perhaps, could what I have further to say essentially add to the evidence already produced. If I am not deceived, I have had the good fortune to elucidate this very difficult text, as well as to throw new light on the subject of the *Therapeutæ*—a subject which has been equally controverted with the other, and which, as far as I know, has been hitherto equally obscure. I am, &c.

Coylton Manse, Ayrshire, 24th July, 1815.

J. BROWN.

REMARKS

On the Meaning of the Hebrew Word מַלְאֵךְ.

IN the *Classical Journal*, (vol. viii. p. 162,) Sir W. Drummond, in answering the objections of your correspondent S. of Norwich to his philological creed respecting the ancient dialects of Palestine and Egypt, has found it convenient to explain away the Scripture, as S. has somewhere since observed: and he has accordingly endeavoured to show, that the word מַלְאֵךְ, translated in our version “*interpreter*,” means merely an “*interlocutor*.” On the meaning of the word, Sir W. D.’s argument very materially depends; and it may therefore, perhaps, not be uninteresting to endeavour to ascertain with precision the true meaning of the word. In the Hebrew text, Gen. xlii. 23, is worded in the following manner: וְהָם לֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי שְׁמֵךְ יוֹסֵף כִּי הַמַּלְאֵךְ בֵּינֵהֶם, these words have been translated in our common version, “and they knew not that Joseph understood *them*; for he spake unto them by an interpreter:” but Sir W. D. contends that it should be rendered “and they knew not that Joseph heard, because the interlocutor (הַמַּלְאֵךְ) was between them.”

The word מַלְאֵךְ is derived from the root מָלַךְ, according to Si-

monis, (Lexicon Heb. Chald. Edit. Eichhorn Halle Saxon. 1793, vol. 1. p. 864, 8vo.) and we learn from him that Weller in his Treatise on Biblical Philology, *Abhandlungen aus der Biblischen Philologie*, p. 50, explains the word to mean *verba inflectere, invertere, convertere, mutare*: now an *interpreter* certainly does change the words he interprets; and, as Simonis remarks, a *mock* (for *ludere, illudere*, is the primary meaning of לרץ) *changes* the words he intends to burlesque; the meanings therefore are more nearly connected than appears at first sight. What grounds Weller may have to go upon, I cannot pretend to say, never having seen his work; but I do not know any unanswerable objections to his hypothesis.

In 2 Chron. xxxii. 31, we read of מליצ, "ambassadors," sent from the princes of Babylon to Hezekiah; now here I think we have rather the idea of *interpreting*, since the Jews, at that period, would hardly, immediately, have understood Babylonish. But here I will allow the sense to be dubious.

The best proof, however, is the use of the derivative word מליצה: we read, in Prov. i. 6. A man—shall attain—to understand a proverb (משל), and the interpretation (מליצה): here מליצה cannot signify an "*interlocution*:" it sometimes also signifies a *speech needing interpretation*: e. g. Hab. ii. 6. "Shall not all these take up a parable (משל) against him, and a taunting proverb (מליצה) against him?" Every one, at all acquainted with the nature of Hebrew poetry, will perceive, that מליצה has nearly the same force with משל, unless he prefer to translate "a parable, and a taunting interpretation against him." Sir W. D. perhaps, will contend for "a taunting *interlocution*;" to which I shall not object, provided he can make it intelligible.

If the מליץ, who was *present* (I will not, for obvious reasons, say *interpreted*) at the conference of Joseph and his brethren, merely *repeated* the words uttered by the parties, Reuben was very bold to make the speech he did, because there was a chance that Joseph himself might hear it: but if this מליץ was really an *interpreter*, and they had reason to believe that Joseph was ignorant of Hebrew, the risk must to him have appeared much less.

If the meaning I have contended for be the right one, שמע will here have the sense of "*understand*," which, for obvious reasons, I shall not spend time in vindicating.

July 19th, 1815.

M.

REMARKS

On the DEFENCE of GABRIEL SIONITA.

IN the *Classical Journal*, vol. xi. p. 70. a Correspondent has very kindly undertaken a defence of Gabriel Sionita, the editor of the Syriac and Arabic versions printed in the Paris Polyglott. However greatly we may be disposed to respect the motive which has induced the writer to endeavour to shield his client, it may be prudent to pause, until we have examined the justice of the censures which have been passed on Sionita, before we acquit him; and in consequence condemn the late learned Michaëlis as a severe and unjust judge. It shall therefore be my endeavour to lay before the reader a few instances of Sionita's deficiencies: from which, I conceive, it will be made plain, even to I. T., that no censure has been passed upon him, which is not amply justified by his errors.

It will be conceded without difficulty to I. T., that Gabriel had a very difficult task to perform: but the errors of which he has been guilty, are of such a nature, that they are by no means excused by this task: we complain not of casual error: but we maintain that he has systematically done wrong, and committed faults unpardonable in a critic living in the seventeenth century. I quote Michaëlis as my authority, partly because I have not the Polyglott at hand, and therefore am unable to collect instances: and also, because he has not been either accused or convicted of having falsely accused Sionita.

Speaking of the Arabic version of the N. T. Michaëlis says; "Gabriel Sionita has taken very unnecessary pains in *correcting* what appeared to him to be bad Arabic in this version, before it was printed in the Paris Polyglott. A translation of this kind is recommended, not by modern ornaments, but by its genuine antiquity."

To alter the text of Scripture, particularly of ancient versions, is certainly a very unpardonable fault in a critic: because this completely destroys, or at least very greatly diminishes the authority of the version, as a source of various readings: yet of this fault has Sionita been repeatedly guilty. The value of the Polyglott Arabic is scarcely worth mentioning in a list of various readings: since in consequence of Sionita's alterations, we never can be sure whether we are quoting a various reading of the version, or a various reading made by its editor.

With respect to the Syriac version, Michaëlis² has "a strong

¹ Introduction to the N. T. vol. ii. pt. i. p. 88. edit. 1803.

² Introd. to N. T. vol. ii. pt. i. p. 15.

suspicion the of this edition," (namely, that ¹ has been altered from mere conjecture, at least many passages in the book of Revelation differ from the first edition, without any reason being assigned for the alteration : and Gabriel Sionita—was not a man on whom we can rely." " I do not proceed to cite the censure passed by Michaëlis on his Latin version ; because I consider it as an unpardonable act in a collector of various readings* to take them from the Latin translations of the Oriental versions, and therefore am not inclined particularly to blame Sionita.

In transcribing or in correcting the Syriac versions, Gabriel certainly has not always paid proper attention to the Hebrew text : if he had he would never have permitted ² to pass in Job, xiii. 16. instead of ³, when the Hebrew has ⁴, and the Arabic version which was made from the Syriac, reads ⁵ : nor in Job, xviii. 17. would he have suffered ⁶ to stand as the translation of ⁷ ; but he would have printed the word ⁸ in conformity with the Arabic, which has ⁹.—I might notice his pointing ¹⁰ as a singular, when the Hebrew has ¹¹, and several similar things : but they are trifling in comparison of what Michaëlis has remarked.

If such, then, be the case, I do not perceive how Michaëlis can justly be said, to have " treated him with merciless severity ;" nor can I see any thing in his language deserving of such a censure. He only states undoubted facts ; and he closes his remarks by observing,⁴ that " the more he considers him as a critic, the less reason he finds to value him ;" and he therefore has omitted in the third and fourth editions of his Introduction, what he had written in the two first editions to the disparagement of Gutbier, who had, in his edition of the Syriac Testament, followed a different system of pointing. To this judgment of Michaëlis, every unprejudiced reader will probably assent : nor does it much signify, whether his edition has failed from his ignorance, his carelessness, or his involuntary haste : the critical value of his labors will in any case be precisely the same : but after what Michaëlis

¹ On these words, Dr. Marsh (Notes on Michaelis, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 544.) has a note : he simply refers us to Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica, tom. iv. p. 170. and Waltoni Prolegom. p. 89. I believe he appeals to them in support of what Michaelis has said : because where he corrects Michaëlis, he does so at length in a note, and does not content himself with barely referring to other writers.

² Michaëlis Grammat. Syr. p. 6. 4to. Halæ, 1784.

³ Michaëlis Gram. Syr. p. 25.

⁴ Introduct. to the N. T. vol. ii. pt. 1 p. 15.

has said, I cannot easily doubt, that all the three causes were combined.

The "milder sentiments of our Walton," do not much contribute to make the reader condemn the judgment of the German critic : but in the short paragraph I. T. has quoted, enough has been said, to set Sionita's pretensions to the character of a sound critic for ever at rest.

The hint respecting candor is inapplicable to Michaëlis, who certainly possessed a greater share of it, than often falls to the lot of critics : and that he was not in general unwilling to defend the reputation of scholars who have been unjustly condemned by their brethren, must be evident to every one, who has read his Introduction to the N. T. ; particularly that part where he defends Wilkins from the censures of Jablonski and La Croze,¹ and Emser² from those of the Lutherans in general.

Upon the whole, therefore, it is not possible for me to agree entirely with I. T. in his defence of Gabriel Sionita : and I think it may be doubted whether he has not in some measure, though unintentionally, committed the same fault, which he has censured in Michaëlis.

July 24, 1815.

M

REMARKS

On some Statements of the Right Honorable

SIR W. DRUMMOND.

I REQUEST permission to make a few observations on some papers written by your learned correspondent Sir W. Drummond : and I make them, not with the desire of provoking a controversy, but merely from a wish to defend and maintain, what I conceive to be truth.

In an examination of a work of Mr. Bryant,³ we find the following words : " Now the Coptic word for an ass's colt is CHX (see the Lexicon of La Croze) and it appears from Woide's Grammar, that the X is often sounded like *th* ; consequently the Egyptian word may be written *Scth*, an ass's colt." If I be not, however, very much mistaken, the words of Woide bear a meaning exactly opposite to that given them by Sir W. D. : they are as

¹ *Introduct.* vol. ii. pt. i. p. 78.

² *Introduct.* vol. ii. pt. i. p. 470.

³ *Class. Journ.* vol. vii. p. 294. (No. xiv.)

follows; “**X** pro *g* ponitur **ΤΕΧΙ**, Tegius. Bonjour Exerc. in Mon. Copt. p. 4. et Apoc. xviii. 10. **ὙΑΡΧΑ- PITHC** pro *μαργαρίτης*: Gen. xlvii. 10, 27. **ΧΕΘΕ** pro *γεσίμ*, Deut. xxiv. 6. **ΧΑΙ** pro *χαί*, nomen oppidi. Hanc literam Græci *accurate* exprimere *non possunt*, modo per *γ*, modo per *θ*, modo per *σ*, modo per *χ*, modo per *τ* indicant. Vide Jablonski Dissert. viii. de Terra Gosen, p. 81—83. e. g. **ΕΧΙΠΘ** *ἄθωγ* et *ἀταγ* (hæc derivatio videtur dubia W.) **ΧΕΥΗΟΥΤ** Sebennythus' nomen urbis: **ΧΙΧΕ**, *γωσεμ*, i. e. terra Herculis: **ΥΕΛΧΙΘΕΔΕΚ** sæpius in MS. Fidelis Sapientie Sahidico, pro *Melchisedek*.—Hebræi cum per **צ** exprimunt.”¹ It is scarcely possible to have more distinct and determinate evidence, that *th* is not the proper power of **X**: “Græci *accurate* exprimere *non possunt*,” and among the various wrong powers they have given it, *θ* is one. The passage that seems to have misled Sir W. D. appears to be the following, which occurs in Woide's Explication of the Coptic Alphabet (Grammat. p. 2.): “**X** Genga **ΧΑΗΧΙΑ** *ع* Arabicum, vel *g* Gallorum in *Gigue*: vel *Gj*; vel uti *τη* *blæsum Anglorum*,” here, however, “*th* *blæsum*” cannot be *θ*, because Woide would then contradict himself in page 8.: the proper power, therefore, in this case, would approach, in some degree, to that given by some grammarians to the Arabic **ث** namely *ths*: but the right force appears to be that of *J* or *G* soft, Arab. *ج* Jim.—In this event, then, Sir W. D. loses a great part of his argument, which is to prove that the Hebrew **ש** and Coptic **CHX** mean the same; and that when Balaam predicted, that “a Sceptre should rise out of Israel, —and destroy **שֵׁשׁ-בַּנִּי**,” he merely meant to say “that the worshippers of ‘Typhon’ should be destroyed, “who was symbolized under the form of an ass.”

The next particular on which I shall remark, occurs in Sir W. Drummond's Essay “concerning Egyptian Idols:”² he there says; “*Αἰδοῖν*, in Greek, comes from *αἰδός*, *venerabilis*.” All the lexicographers, however, whose writings I have seen, derive it from *αἰδώς*, “pudor,” with one meaning of which it is synonymous. In Scapula's Lexicon, *αἰδώς* is put first, as the primary root: and in Constantine, to which, however, I have not at present access, if

¹ La Croze (Lexicon Egypt. p. 164.) calls this city *Semanutha*; “**ΧΕΥΗΟΥΤ** *سمنود* *Semanutha, urbs Egypti*. Kircher. p. 208.”

² Woide Grammat. Egypt. p. 8. 4to. Oxon. 1778.

³ Num. xxiv. 17.

⁴ Class. Journ. vol. ix. p. 579. (Supplement to No. xviii.)

I remember right,¹ the note on the word αἰδοῖον, is closed with an etymology from Clemens Alexandrinus, who clearly derives it from αἰδώς; and Hederic, who is generally reckoned good authority, says, “ab αἰδώς.”—Sir W. D. then, would have done better had he given the same explication of it that he has done of the Latin “veretrum,” which, as he says truly, is “*equivalent to PARS VERENDA.*”

Sir W. D. asserts, that “the Greeks expressed the Hebrew *ain* by their own *gamma*, and the consequence has been, that they have written the names wrong, in which the *ain* occurs.”² If I remember right, in some former Essay, he asserted that this was “always” the case: but as I am unable to find the passage, I cannot be positive. The following collation, however, will sufficiently show, that the substitution of *Γ* for *ʿ* seldom occurs: I have not studiously selected my instances, as the occurrence of two or three exceptions from what generally is the case will show: the Greek words are taken from the text adopted by Dr. Holmes, in his valuable edition of the Septuagint:

עֲלִי	Ἰαλι
אֲבֹנֵי הָעֵזֶר	Ἀβωνεζιζ
פֶּרֶעָה	Φαραώ
יְהוֹשֻׁעַ	Ἰωσηφ
עֹזָה	Γάζα
עֶקְרָח	Ἀκαζων
קִרְיַת יִצְחָק	Καζινοζελμ
בַּעֲלִים	Βααλιμ
עֲשֹׂתָרָה	Ἀστωωθ
בֶּאֱרַשְׁבַּי	Βερσαβε
שַׁעֲלִים	Σεγαλιμ.

We see, then, that out of eleven instances, (not peculiarly selected) in two only is *ʿ* expressed by Gamma. Sir W. D.'s argument, that *Pror*, not *Phigor*, is the right reading, remains indeed the same; and if the state of the question be at all altered, it is clearly in Sir W.'s favor: at the same time, it was proper to notice the inaccuracy, which might, perhaps, at some future time, or by some other writer, be employed where a mistake would be more important.

Nov. 5, 1814.

M.

¹ Perfectly correct. Ed.

² Class. Journ. vol. ix. p. 581.

ARABIAN TALES,

ORIGINALLY PERSIAN.

IN a little volume bearing the title of *Les Voyages de Sind-bâd le Marin*, which issued from the royal press at Paris, during the year 1814, Mons. Langlès, an Orientalist of very high celebrity, has given us the Arabic text of قصه السند باد البحري *Kisseh al Sind-bâd al bahri*, or Story of *Sindbad the Sailor* (so well known through M. Galland's French *Mille et une Nuits*, and our common English editions of the "Arabian Nights' Entertainments,") with a new literal translation, and many excellent notes: besides a preface of thirty pages. In this M. Langlès states his opinion concerning the true origin of these Arabian tales; and would trace them to a Persian source. It has been remarked, he informs us, by several writers, that *Sind-bâd*, *Hindbâd*, and even the names of principal personages in the "Thousand and one Nights," belong to the Persian language, a circumstance which confirms the assertion of a most learned and judicious Arabian author, who declares that those tales were borrowed from the Persians. This author is *Masudi* the historian, and we shall here quote his words—"I have already mentioned," says he, "the books brought to us, and those translated for our use from the Persian, Indian, and Greek languages, and the manner of their composition. Such, for instance, as the work entitled in Persian *Hezar afzaneh* (هزار افزانه) or the "Thousand Tales," of which the Arabic paraphrase is called *Alef Khirâfet* (الف خرافة) a name wherein *Khiraftet* is synonymous with the Persian word *afzaneh*, and this work is generally designated under the title of *Alef leilet we leilet* (الف ليلة و ليلة) "The Thousand and one Nights."—It contains the history of a king, his vizier, and two daughters, one named *Shir-zâd*, (شیرزاد) the other *Din-azâd* (دینازاد). Such also is the book of *Tseqil* (or *Tseqiled* شقیلد) and of *Shimâs* (شیماس) and the anecdotes it relates concerning a king of India, and his vizier. We may add likewise the *Book of Sind-bad*, (کتاب السندباد) and other compositions of the same kind."

This formal testimony of *Masaoudi* renders it unnecessary for me, says M. Langlès, to offer any further argument against the conjectures of some learned men, who have considered the "Thousand and

one Nights," as a work originally Arabian, and perhaps even European. He believes that the names of Arabians, and many pictures of their manners, are interpolations of the translators or imitators; and the conspicuous figure which *Harùn al Rashid* makes in these stories may arise from his celebrity among the writers of Eastern Romance; equal to that which Charlemagne enjoyed among the old French *Romanciers*.

Under the auspices of *Harùn al Rashid*, and of the Khalifs who immediately succeeded him, his sons *Al Amin* and *Al Mamun*, (that is, during the last years of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century of our era) the Arabs enriched their literature by the translations of Coptic, Greek, Syriac, Persian, and Indian works. But amidst the wars and other calamities that desolated Asia, after the Khalifat of Baghdad had ceased (in 1258) the *Gabrs* or Fireworshippers of Persia, driven by religious persecution from their unhappy country, were scarcely able to preserve some mutilated fragments of their *Zendavesta*, the code of their great legislator *Zeratusht* or Zoroaster, and we may suppose that but few volumes, written in the *pahlavi* or ancient dialect of Persia escaped the general destruction: although the most interesting or popular works may be still known, however imperfectly, through the medium of translations made by the Arabs.

Monsieur Langlès could not discover that any copy of the *Thousand and One Nights*, nor even of *Sindbad's* story, exists in modern Persian, those in the more ancient dialect having perished, it is to be feared, many centuries ago. He has consulted in transcribing the Arabic text of *Sindbad*, and in translating it into French, two Manuscripts of that noble collection, the Bibliothèque du Roi—an establishment wherein (as we understand from several who have lately visited Paris,) he fills the important office of 'Conservateur des Manuscrits,' in such a manner as to afford the most general satisfaction. He also collated others procured for him by M. Caussin de Perseval, and by his colleague Don Raphael, Professor of Arabic, and by M. Marcel, director of the royal press, who brought three copies from Egypt.

After Sinbad, M. Langlès has added the *Keidalnasa* (كيدالنسا) "Stratagems; Frauds, or Cunning Devices of Women," a title much more happily expressed in French by "Ruse des Femmes." Of this entertaining little story which occupies but nine pages, we shall offer an account in some future Number of the Classical Journal, remarking here that of both works, the Arabic text is, as might well be expected from the superintendence of so able an orientalist as M. Langlès, printed with considerable accuracy and neatness.

D.

MOMI MISCELLANEA SUBSECTIVA.

No. III.

1. **ALTHOUGH** Portus was a useful pioneer in literature, he seems, notwithstanding, to have been but a raw adept in metre. His note on the word *μακρομέτρην*, in Suidas, shows this clearly enough.

Μαιευομένην, ἀντὶ τοῦ νεοττοτροφοῦσαν. Ἐνρον γυναῖκα ὄνθας μαι-
ευομένην. *Suidas.*

Ἐξὸν γυναικα senarius erit, si legus, ut legendum suspicor, Ἐξὸν γυναικας ὀρθιθας ματενομερας. In sexta erit anapaestus. In quarta spondæus, loco iambi, quod et alibi [qu. ? where] factum monuimus, vel τὸ μ iam corripietur, ut sit iambus. *Portus.*

The following is the true metrical order of the *Portæan* senarius
| — — — | — — — | — — — | — — — | — — — | — — — | ; which being pre-
mised, I shall leave it to others to descry the number of blunders
contained in it. This reminds one of Markland's, and, after him,
Brunck's way of marking off the fifteen-hundred-and-eighty-second
line of Euripides's *Phœnissæ*. See Porson's note.

2. Quis multâ gracilis te puer in rosâ
Perfusus liquidis urget odoribus
Grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?
Cui *flavum religas comam*,
Simplex munditiis?—Hor. Odd. i. 5.

In the fourth line it is not improbable that Horace had in his eye a line from a Greek Epigram quoted by Suidas under the word Βόστρυχος. Βόστρυχος πλέγμα τριχῶν γυναικείων. Ἐν ἐπιγράμματι· Εἰπέ τίτι πλέξαις ἐν Βόστρυχον; I have not seen this adduced as a parallel before.

3. The family of the *Didymi* seems, if we are to believe what Suidas says, to have engrossed a degree of literary talent, or literary industry, unprecedented in the annals of book-reading. One of these, the *spes gregis* of a *salt-seller*, or *bacon-facturer*, or something of the kind, and surnamed moreover *Chalcinterus* or *Brass-gut*, appositely enough, is said to have left behind him the enormous number of *three thousand five hundred* volumes. Δίδυμος, Διδύμου παριχοπώλου, γραμματικὸς Ἀριστάρχειος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς. Γεγωνῆς [γεγονῶς] ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίνου [Ἀντωνίου] καὶ Κικέρωνος, καὶ ἕως Αὐγούστου. Χαλκέντερος κληθεὶς διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ βιβλία ἐπιμέοήν. Φασι γάρ αὐτὸν συγγεγραφέναι ὑπὲρ τὰ τρισχίλια πεντακῶσια βιβλία.

4. Ἐφιάλης· ἡ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνατρέχουσα ἀναθυμίασις ἐξ ἀδηφαγίας, καὶ ἀπενείας, παρὰ ἰατροῖς Ἐφιάλης λέγεται. Ὁ λεγόμενος παρὰ πολλοῖς Βαβονζικφόριος. Suidas in Ἐφιάλης.

This distemper is neither more nor less than the *Nightmare*, called by the later Latin writers *Incubus*. No poet has perhaps described this

better than Virgil (*Æn.* xii. 908), as any one will confess, who has felt its influence.

Ac velut in somnis, oculos ubi languida pressit
Nocte quies, nequidquam avidos extendere cursus
Velle videmur, et in mediis conatibus ægri
Succidimus; non lingua valet, non corpore notæ
Sufficiunt vires; nec vox, nec verba sequuntur.

The idea was perhaps borrowed from Homer. (*Iliad* X. 199.)

Ὡς δ' ἐν ὄνειρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν,
Οὕτ' ἄρ' ὁ τὸν δύναται ὑποφύγειν, οὐθ' ὁ διώκειν.

How much Virgil has improved upon it even the blind may discover.

5. One would imagine that, when Bartolozzi engraved his Venus, he had either seen the following Greek Epigram from the fourth book of the *Anthologia*, or a translation of it.

Τέσσαρές εἰσιν ἔρωτες· ὁ μὲν στέφος ἡμφικαλύπτει
Μητρὸς ἱῆς· ὁ δὲ χεῖλος ἔχει ποτὶ πίδακι μαζοῦ·
Οἱ δὲ δύνω παιζουσι παρ' ἵχνεσιν· εἷμα δὲ κρύπτει
Μηρῷ γείτονα χῶρον ὅλης γυμνῆς Ἀφροδίτης.

6. We remark for the sake of such of our readers as may not have observed it, that the Greek Scholia in Barnes's Euripides abound with interpolations even more than those in his Homer. What wonder indeed, when we see that this foolish Greek Professor has repeatedly stuffed in even Scholia of his own, and affixed his signature to them in mongrel Greek, forsooth! Let the reader only refer to *Alcest.* 519. and 581. In his note on the *Iph. Aul.* 775. he refers us with all the gravity imaginable to his *Franciad*, an heroic poem we suspect by the title, but which we never heard of elsewhere, and certainly, have never seen. It appears also from *Hippol.* 525. that this astonishing genius wrote a poem, amatory or otherwise, cycloped *Esther*. He wrote it probably when the widow fell in love with him.

7. Piscis in disco
Mihī datur
Ab Archiepiscopo
sed non ponatur,
Quia non mihī bibere datur.

TRANSLATION.

They sent me fish
In a dish,
From the Archbishop-
op is omitted here,
Because there is no beer.

Who wrote these lines? Who translated them?

INQUIRY
INTO THE
CAUSES OF THE DIVERSITY OF HUMAN CHARACTER,
IN VARIOUS
AGES, NATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS;

By the late PROFESSOR SCOTT, King's College, Aberdeen.

No. VII.—*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 66.*

SECT. IV.

Of the Opinions of various Writers concerning the Effects of Climate.

THUS, then, it results from the preceding investigations, that climate produces very remarkable and permanent effects upon the human character and constitution. It invigorates or enfeebles the corporeal frame; it braces or relaxes the tone of the fibres; it prompts to activity, or encourages indolence; and thus inspires courage or timidity, and promotes or retards the spirit of enterprise and improvement. It has, besides, a very considerable effect on the headstrong appetite which unites the sexes, which it, in many cases, stimulates to an unwarrantable excess, or chills into apathy.

Such are the effects which proceed, as it were immediately, from the influence of climate, and which seem as certainly to be due to an ardent or frigid atmosphere, as the luxuriance of the Egyptian palm, or the stunted growth of the Norwegian oak. There are other effects of equal importance, which, though not so obviously dependent upon climate, yet appear, upon investigation, to be fairly ascribable to that source. These are the permanent condition of the female sex, which, by the influence of climate, arises to more dignity in one region of the world than in another. By the same influence also the ordinary occupations, manners, and amusements of a people are much controlled, and become either innocent and rational, or grovelling and vicious. In the last place, the influence of climate is to be detected in the important concern of laws and government, which in some regions have a natural tendency to perfection, while in others they seem doomed to a perpetual debasement.

In ascribing so many important effects to the influence of climate, I may seem to have fallen into the error of which many of the ancient writers, and some of the moderns, have been justly accused, who have been inclined to derive the diversities of human character and disposition from this cause alone. The authors, indeed, who have supported this opinion, are of high respectability, and their names carry with them the weight of authority; but I am by no means disposed implicitly to subscribe to their doctrine, for reasons which will immediately appear.

Among these authors, one of the earliest, and no doubt most respectable, is Aristotle, who states, in the most unequivocal terms, the all-powerful control of climate, and ascribes to this cause alone the proud superiority which his countrymen enjoyed over the surrounding nations in arms, in arts, and in literature. They were, he supposes, placed in that happy temperature which was most favorable to the perfection of the human faculties, and by which they were naturally fitted to hold in subjection the less happily constituted nations around them.

The same superiority which Aristotle ascribes to the climate of Greece is assumed by Vitruvius to the peculiar atmosphere of his countrymen, the Romans. "As," says he, "the planet Jupiter lies between the fervid heat of Mars and the piercing cold of Saturn; so Italy, in the centre of the temperate zone, enjoys every thing that is favorable in the opposite climates. It is thus that by conduct in war the Romans overcome the impetuous force of Northern barbarians, and by the vigor of their arms confound the politic schemes of their Southern neighbours. Divine Providence appears to have placed the Romans in this happy situation, in order that they might become masters of the world."

This writer has entered into the investigation of the effects of climate with peculiar copiousness; and the whole of the first chapter of his 6th book is occupied in describing the influence of the atmosphere on the human constitution and temper. "The sun," says he, "where he draws out a moderate degree of moisture, preserves the body in a temperate state; but where his rays are more intense, he drains the body of its moisture. In very cold regions, where the moisture is not destroyed by heat, the body, imbibing the dewy air, rises to a great size, and the voice acquires a deep tone. Northern nations, accordingly, by means of cold and moisture, have large bodies, a white skin, red hair, grey eyes, and much blood. Those, on the contrary, who are near the equator, are of small stature, tawny complexion, curled hair, black eyes, slender legs, and little blood. From want of blood they are cowardly, but can bear feverish disorders well, their constitutions being accustomed to heat. The people of the North, on the contrary, sink under a fever; but, from abundance of blood, they are bold in war."

In another part of the chapter, he adds, "From the thinness of the air and enlivening heat, Southern nations are quick in thought and acute in reasoning. Those in the North, on the contrary, who breathe a thick and cold atmosphere, are dull and stupid." This position he illustrates from the history of serpents, which, in the heats of summer, are active and vigorous; but during the winter become torpid and immoveable. He then goes on to add: "It is not, therefore, at all surprising that heat should sharpen the understanding, and cold blunt it; that the Southern nations should be ready in counsel, and acute in thought; but make no figure in war, their courage being exhausted by the heat of the sun; while the inhabitants of cold climates are prone to war, and rush on vehemently without any fear, but are slow of understanding."

Vegetius accounts for the different characters of men upon principles precisely similar. "Nations," says he, "near the sun, being dried up

by excessive heat, are said to have a greater acuteness of understanding, but a deficiency of blood; on which account they are destitute of firmness and resolution in war, and dread a wound, as if conscious of their want of blood. The Northern people, on the contrary, removed from the ardor of the sun, are less remarkable for the powers of the mind; but, abounding in blood, they are prone to war."¹

In a similar strain of reasoning, Servius says, in his Commentary upon Virgil's *Æneid*, "The Africans are crafty, the Greeks fickle, and the Gauls of dull understanding; all which arises from the influence of climate."²

The limited knowledge and want of experience of the ancients form an apology for their ascribing more to the influence of climate than was justly its due. They were acquainted with but a small portion of the habitable world, and from the imperfect state of their navigation and commerce had penetrated but a little way into the countries of barbarous nations. They were, therefore, unable to contrast the manners of these rude tribes one with another, and to observe those minuter diversities of manner and disposition, which could scarcely be ascribed to the mere influence of their atmosphere. In the ancient world the number of polished nations was inconsiderable, and they had not experienced those vicissitudes of condition, those alternate elevations and depressions, that sudden succession of grandeur and declension, which demonstrate the instability of all sublunary establishments, and the futility of ascribing to permanent causes the temporary superiority of any particular race of men.

But the moderns are placed in a situation which enables them to appreciate more accurately the permanent advantages of any particular region or climate. The page of history informs them that the boasted pre-eminence of the inhabitants of Greece in arts and arms has passed away, and left scarcely a vestige of its existence. The empire of the Romans, too, has long ceased; although Italy, more fortunate than the soil of Athens and of Sparta, has continued for many ages to be the nursery of art and emporium of taste. The moderns, therefore, ought to be aware that there are other causes which affect the pre-eminence of the human character, besides mere physical situation. They ought to be convinced, that even in the most favorable soil the seeds of genius may be choked, and the blossoms of talent withered, if they are not sheltered from storms that gather from without.

Notwithstanding the apparent obviousness of this truth, several writers of great name among the moderns have been strenuous advocates for the sole and paramount influence of climate in determining the human character; while others have been guilty of the opposite

¹ "Omnes nationes quæ vicinæ sunt soli, nimio calore siccitas, amplius quidem sapere, sed minus habere sanguinis dicunt; ac propterea constantiam ac fiduciam cominus non habere pugnandi, quia metuunt vulnera, qui ac exiguum sanguinem habere noverunt. Contra, septentrionales populi, remoti a solis ardoribus, inconsultiores quidem, sed tamen largo sanguine redundantes, sunt ad bella promptissimi."—(De re militari, lib. 1, cap. 2)

² "Atti versipelles, Græci leves, Galli pigrioris ingenii, quod natura climatum facit."—(Lib. 6, v. 724.)

error, and have denied that climate, unaided by moral causes, possesses any control whatever upon the dispositions of men.

Mallet, in the Introduction to his *History of Denmark*, adopts the reasoning of Vitruvius and Vegetius, and strenuously endeavours to derive the courage and ferocity of the Scandinavians from the physical influence of their climate alone. "A great abundance of blood," says he, "fibres strong and rigid, vigor inexhaustible, formed the temperament of the Germans, the Scandinavians, and of all other people who live under the same climate. Robust by the climate, and hardened with exercise, confidence in bodily strength formed their character. A man who relies on his own force, cannot bear restraint, nor submission to the arbitrary will of another. As he has no occasion for artifice, he is altogether a stranger to fraud or dissimulation. As he is always ready to repel force by force, he is not suspicious nor distrustful. His courage prompts him to be faithful in friendship, generous, and even magnanimous. He is averse to occupations that require more assiduity than action, because moderate exercise affords not to his blood and fibres that degree of agitation which suits them. Hence his disgust at arts and manufactures; and, as passion labors to justify itself, hence his opinion, that war only and hunting are honorable professions."

Had Mr. Mallet carefully examined the dispositions of the various tribes whom he includes under the title of Germans and Scandinavians, he would have found evidence that some of them are not altogether averse to contemplative occupations, or addicted solely to war and hunting. He would have found the inhabitants of Iceland, for example, from the most remote periods, a pacific and industrious people; affectionate and friendly in their intercourse with other nations, and considerably advanced in the knowledge of letters. According to the best evidence which we possess, the study of history has been a favorite pursuit with the Icelanders from the most remote ages; and they have long been possessed of historical chronicles of great curiosity, the perusal of which forms one of their principal amusements during the tedious nights to which the winter of their climate is exposed.

Even Tacitus, in his account of the German tribes, affords evidence, that ferocity and the love of war, though generally prevalent, yet did not universally obtain among the people whose manners he has so philosophically illustrated. The Chauci, who inhabited an extensive district in the North of Germany, he describes as "a race of people, the noblest among the Germans, who choose to maintain their grandeur by justice rather than by violence. Without the desire of plunder, and free from the apprehension of weakness, they live in quiet and security; they provoke no wars, and are enriched by no rapine. It is (he adds) a remarkable proof both of their power and of their virtue, that without oppressing any, they have attained a superiority over all. Yet, if occasion requires, they are ready to take the field, and their troops are speedily raised."

¹ "Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantum Chauci, sed et implent: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus, quique magnitudinem suam

The most respectable of all the modern writers who have ascribed to the sole influence of climate the principal diversities of human character, is the President Montesquieu, to whose opinions a more than ordinary degree of deference is certainly due; as there are few authors who have illustrated in so truly philosophical a manner the causes which affect the various institutions and progressive improvements of civil society.

In the second chapter of the fourteenth book of the *Spirit of Laws*, Montesquieu has entered into a minute and even anatomical discussion of the direct effects of climate upon the human body, from which he deduces its influence upon the mind. Cold, he observes, shuts up the extremities of the external fibres of the body, by which their elasticity is increased, and the return of the blood from the extremities towards the heart is promoted. It likewise diminishes the length of these fibres, and thus also increases their force. Heat, on the contrary, relaxes the extremities of the fibres, and prolongs them; it therefore diminishes their tone and elasticity.

On this account, says Montesquieu, the people of cold climates have most vigor. The action of the heart, and the re-action of the extremities, are better performed, the juices are in a juster equilibrium, the blood is better determined towards the heart, and reciprocally the heart has a greater degree of power. This superior force ought to produce important effects: for example, more confidence and courage; a greater assurance of superiority, that is to say, a less desire of vengeance; more opinion of security, that is to say, a greater degree of frankness, less of suspicion, of policy, and of stratagem. Place a man, says our author, in a close and heated place; he will suffer, from the reasons here assigned, a great depression of spirit. If, in this situation, we were to propose to him a bold action, we should probably find him little disposed to execute it; his present feebleness will effectually discourage him. He will fear every thing, because he feels that he can accomplish nothing. The people of hot countries are timid like old men; those of cold climates are courageous like the young.

Montesquieu next carries his anatomical investigations into the effects of heat and cold upon the nervous system, and corroborates his opinions by experiments upon the papillæ of a sheep's tongue. The result is that the people of warm climates, though timid, are of exquisite sensibility, prone to the pleasures of love, and easily transported into the excess of joy or grief. But the people of the North, though courageous and of great bodily strength, are destitute of vivacity and sentiment. "*J'ai vu,*" says this lively author, "*les opera d'Angleterre et d'Italie; ce sont les mêmes pièces & les mêmes acteurs; mais la même musique produit des effets si différens sur les deux nations, l'une est si calme, & l'autre si transportée, que cela paroît inconcevable.*"

malit justitia tueri. Sine cupiditate, sine impotentia, quetti, secretique, nulla provocant bella, nullis raptibus aut latrociniis populantur. Idque præcipuum virtutis ac virium argumentum est, quod, ut superiores agunt, non per injurias assequuntur. Prompta tamen omnibus arma, ac, si res poscat, exercitus."—(De mor. Germ.)

These physical causes, according to our author, are amply sufficient to account for the permanent characters of the inhabitants of the different regions of the earth; for the spirit of enterprise and improvement which has produced such beneficial effects in the temperate climes of Europe; and for the want of that spirit which has so long characterised the tropical regions. "If," says he, "with that delicacy of organs, which renders the people of the East sensible to every impression, you join an extreme indolence of spirit naturally accompanying that of the body, and which renders the spirit incapable of any action, of any effort, or any struggle; you will comprehend that the mind, when once it has received impressions, is unable to change them. It is this that occasions the laws, the manners, and the customs, even those which appear most indifferent, as the fashion of dress, to be the same in the East at this day, as they were a thousand years ago."—(Liv. 14, ch. 4.)

It is sufficiently apparent from the reasonings of the preceding sections, that I am by no means inclined to refuse to climate the most important influence in regulating the natural propensities and dispositions of men. From the examination of facts, the only evidence that is entitled to much weight in an investigation of this sort, I have been led to maintain that the inhabitants of temperate climates are naturally possessed of many important advantages over those either of the tropical or polar regions; that they are, as is maintained by Montesquieu and the other authors just quoted, naturally of greater strength, of more activity, and less addicted to sensual indulgence; nay, that these physical advantages are calculated to produce yet more important moral effects; that they elevate the rank and estimation of the female sex, give dignity and usefulness to the ordinary manners and pursuits of the people of temperate regions, and promote the establishment of good government and equitable laws.

But in deriving these important effects from the influence of climate, I am by no means disposed to consider this as the sole cause of the natural diversity of the dispositions of the various tribes of men. The influence of climate is indeed powerful, but it may be counteracted; its effects are very important; but there are other causes of not less efficacy, which, if they be fairly brought into action, may either prevent the baneful influence, or oppose the beneficial operation of this purely physical principle. It is for overlooking the power of these moral causes that the writers, whose opinions I have been quoting, are censurable. They, perhaps, have ascribed no more to climate than it is really qualified to effect; but they have not considered the important principles by which its operation may be checked, promoted, or altogether counteracted.

Were it true that certain climates are calculated always to produce men of certain talents and dispositions, we should find some favored regions of the earth assuming a permanent superiority, and constantly giving law to the rest. We should invariably find eminence in arts or prowess in arms confined to a certain longitude and latitude. We should have only to consult the map to discover where the sciences are doomed to arrive at maturity; where legislation will be perfected; or

where the warlike spirit will finally produce the most formidable effects. We should have to arrange the nations and countries of the world, less by geographical divisions, than by a scale of temperature suited to express the gradations of permanent excellence.

But the history of nations completely refutes this principle of calculation. It shows that pre eminence, both in arts and arms, has successively belonged to people the most remote from each other, and who have lived under every variety of climate and atmosphere. We find the sceptre of extensive dominion first assumed by the nations of the East, and passing successively from the Assyrians to the Medes, and from the Medes to the Persians. We then behold the genius of the Western nations expanding itself, and the Greeks carrying on a successful contest with the formidable power of the Persian monarch. In Greece it was that intellectual pursuits attained the highest eminence to which they arose in the ancient world. But even the philosophy and literature of Greece were not exclusively her own; by her own avowal they were borrowed from Egypt and India; and thus, like the spirit of conquest, first sprung up in the torrid regions of the earth.

The gradual developement of the genius of Greece, and her advancement from an inconsiderable beginning to the sway of the most powerful nations of the ancient world, forms one of the most interesting objects of contemplation that history affords. But her political reign was short. The conquering progress of Alexander over the Eastern nations, as it resembled in its splendor the dazzling of the meteor, resembled it no less in its fleeting duration. It soon faded away; and the glory of the Grecian name faded with it to revive no more.

The heroic achievements of Greece are succeeded, on the theatre of ancient history, by those of Rome. The conquests of the Romans were more permanent, and more completely combined with the parent state than those of the Greeks. The history of this people exhibits the remarkable phenomenon of a dominion gradually extended from the most trifling commencement over the fairest and most fertile portion of the known world; and at length swallowing up, like a growing torrent, almost every nation and every state in one immense empire. But it was by moral, not less than by physical causes, that victory was so long attached to the Roman arms. While frugality, activity, and public spirit, prevailed at Rome, the commonwealth flourished and increased its power; but when luxury and vice were introduced with the spoils of conquered nations; and corruption took place of patriotism; the Roman glory was extinguished, and the mighty empire was torn to pieces with much greater rapidity than it had been at first consolidated.

How vain then was the boast of Aristotle, that his countrymen were placed in a climate most favorable to the perfection of human talents; and how unfounded the assertion of Vitruvius, that the Romans, by their peculiar situation, seemed intended by Providence to become permanent masters of the world! The soil of Athens and of Sparta, the birth-place of Socrates, of Plato, of Euripides, of Sophocles, and

Demosthenes; the scene of the martial achievements of Miltiades, of Leonidas, of Themistocles, and Agesilaus, has for many revolving ages bowed under the yoke of the most oppressive despotism. It has continued subject to a conqueror equally regardless of its letters, its science, and its laws, and who has effaced almost the very ruins of its ancient grandeur, and obliterated even the titles by which the memory of its former fame might be preserved.

If Rome has suffered a less degrading fate, it has at least long ceased to give laws to the surrounding nations; it has been reduced within its ancient limits, and obliged to compensate by the cultivation of the arts of peace for the loss of military fame. Those Northern tribes, who were stigmatized by the ancient Romans as rude Barbarians, unqualified to excel either in arts or arms, have, in their turn, assumed the sway. They have overthrown the mighty fabric of the Roman power, and erected on its ruins many independent empires, which now vie in celebrity with the fame of ancient Italy and Greece; they have transplanted the sciences and arts of the ancient world into a colder, though not less genial, soil; and have proved that mental superiority is not confined to those regions where the pride of former philosophers had fixed its limits. The prowess in arms, the wisdom in counsel, the philosophy and literature of the ancient world, have travelled even into the Hyperborean regions, and have taken up their abode among a people said by the Romans to be severed from the civilized part of the globe; they are now found to flourish even among the

— penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.

Thus there is a period of infancy, maturity, and decay in the history of nations and progress of civilization. Where the situation is favorable for the development of human talents, there we may expect that improvement in arts or in arms will first naturally arise. By the concurrence of fortunate circumstances, a superiority may be gained over the surrounding nations. The spirit of conquest will then predominate, and if not checked by the dictates of reason and prudence, will draw after it the love of pomp, of luxurious indulgence, and at length corruption and complete effeminacy. A hardier and poorer people will then be tempted to attack the tottering fabric of a corrupt empire. They will find its spoils an easy conquest; but they will be exposed in their turn to the degeneracy which so commonly attends the easy acquisition of wealth or power, and to the decay of valor and public spirit which luxury introduces, and by which they become ready to fall a prey to the first hardy invader.

Such are the revolutions to which states and kingdoms are naturally liable; and such have been the principal causes of the declension of the great empires which have in succession figured upon the theatre of history. The contemplation of this fact has given rise to the doctrine, that as in the human body there is a period of infancy and manhood which are necessarily succeeded by decrepitude and decay, so in the political constitution of states, the period of maturity necessarily carries along with it the seeds of future corruption; and the attain-

ment of grandeur and power is certainly followed by feebleness and final dissolution. It must be acknowledged that the history of the world gives plausibility to this opinion, and serves rather to prove that such is the natural progress of all human institutions. But it is yet reasonable to hope that the body politic may be so constituted as effectually to resist, not only attacks from without, but also the sources of corruption which it carries within itself. That an equilibrium may be established among the different jarring interests of the state; and a principle of reform and salutary correction be introduced, by which the tendency to dissolution may be counteracted, and fresh vigor instilled into the decaying members of the constitution.

If, then, there is a succession of eminence and inferiority, of glory and ignominy, in the annals of nations which have long occupied certain regions of the world, it is in vain to pretend that any climate is qualified to give a permanent superiority to the people who enjoy it, or that the beneficial or injurious effects of the soil and atmosphere may not be counteracted by other causes which are not less powerful. It will scarcely be pretended that the climates of nations have changed, as they themselves have risen into eminence or become degenerate; or that their political revolutions have been accompanied by corresponding changes in the state of their atmosphere.

But even this assertion, unfounded as it would appear to be, would not serve to vindicate the doctrine of those who assert the paramount influence of climate. For it were easy to prove, that in climates, altogether similar, nations have existed who at the same period of time have exhibited very different degrees of improvement; and have in their contemporary history, the one attained to eminence in arts and arms, while the other showed no tendency to emerge from barbarism.

In the history of the Carthaginians we have a striking example of a people counteracting, by the spirit of enterprize, the natural disadvantages of climate and situation. Though placed amid the burning deserts of Africa, and exposed to the debilitating action of a tropical sun, they were eminent for their industry and activity. They built spacious and highly ornamented cities; they cultivated and improved all the useful and elegant arts of life; they possessed the most extensive navy of the ancient world, and carried the adventurous spirit of commerce to an extent that has scarcely been rivalled by modern enterprize. They also gave proofs of skill in legislation, and furnished a remarkable example of a republican government situated in a tropical climate. With respect to their valor in arms, the history of their wars with the Sicilians and Romans proves, that in this, as in other accomplishments, they had attained a more than ordinary eminence. The memorable invasion of Italy by Hannibal sufficiently establishes, that if at length the fortune of the Roman arms prevailed, it was not without an arduous struggle that the Carthaginians resigned their liberties, and that they alone of all the contemporary nations were able to wage a contest with the predominating genius of Rome, which for a long period continued doubtful.

While the Carthaginians had thus carried the arts and embellishments of life to a high degree of perfection, the neighbouring nations

on the African coast were sunk in ignorance and barbarism. Nor have they at any succeeding period emerged from the insignificance to which the want of all intellectual improvement condemns them. The only nations of Africa who have risen into any considerable degree of eminence for political wisdom, the cultivation of the arts, or military enterprize, are the Egyptians and Carthaginians; and we may, perhaps, add the modern Abyssinians. The celebrity of the two former has long ceased to exist but in tradition, and that of the latter is at best but dubious. It is, therefore, plain, that the climate of Africa is not naturally adapted to the perfection of human talents; yet even in this unfavorable soil, by the concurrence of peculiar circumstances, arose the mighty rival of Rome, and the emporium of the chief commercial enterprize of the ancient world.

The modern Moors of Africa, who are descended from the enterprising followers of Mahomet, have, under the most scorching sun, retained a great share of activity and acuteness of intellect, and form a striking contrast to the indolent and peaceable negroes with whom they are intermingled. Shaw says of this people, that the small progress they have made in the arts and sciences is not the effect of any incapacity or natural stupidity. The Moors, he says, possess quickness and even genius; and if they do not apply themselves to study, it is because, deprived of every motive to emulation, and continually harassed by their government, they have neither the leisure nor inclination for such a pursuit. The Moors, born slaves, like the greater part of the Orientals, are naturally enemies to every kind of trouble, which has not their personal interest for its immediate object.

The Chinese nation may likewise be quoted as an example of a people who in a sultry climate have, from the remotest ages, been remarkable for their industry and activity; who have carried many of the arts of life to an uncommon degree of perfection; and who have likewise displayed no inconsiderable degree of genius in some of the pursuits of science and literature. This extraordinary people seem to furnish an exception to the political maxim of which we have so lately taken notice, and which pronounces the instability of all establishments of power, or systems of government. From the remotest records of history, their policy, their manners, and their laws, have undergone little change; and though revolutions have taken place in the dynasties which occupy the throne, the integrity of the empire has withstood the shock, and the nation may be said to have remained nearly the same in power, in influence, and in celebrity, from the first details of its history to the present day. To inquire into the causes of this remarkable phenomenon, which affords so strong a proof of the possibility of giving permanency to political establishments, would be entirely foreign from our present purpose.

ENGLISH PRIZE POEM,

Spoken at the Apposition, St. Paul's School, April 13th, 1815.

* PROMETHEUS.

*His Present Misery—Former Happiness—
Despair.*

O HOLY light! new kindling into morn,
Whose orient beams a gladdened world adorn!
Onward thou ridest in thy gay career,
To clothe with purple spring the golden year:
But ah! thy joy-attempered rays impart
No kindred feeling to my mournful heart;
O'er all the world thy radiant glories shine,
Cheer every cheek, but cannot brighten mine.
Soft Sleep, who pours his balm o'er every eye,
Who lulls each bosom and arrests each sigh,
From my sad brow and aching heart is fled;
These chains affright him, and this rocky bed!
Unhappy wretch! in charity to man,
Thy crime, thy punishment, thy woe began:
Here must thou lie while thunders roar around,
Bend the scathed oak, and rock the upheaving ground;
And as around its head the tempest sails,
This summit scowls o'er the deep blackening vales,
Here in primeval ruggedness of form,
Stern Nature forges the relentless storm,
Unchains the cataract, directs its course,
To crush the valley with resistless force,
And, hoarsely howling, midnight horror flings,
And pours a saddening gloom, and waves her raven wings!
O! say, is Justice banished from above,
Where once she smiled encircling Peace and Love;
When Mercy beaming with unclouded ray
Blessed Saturn's kingdom and paternal sway?
Yes! she is fled, she leaves the accursed place,
The hateful Tyrant, and Heaven's recreant race.
So when the thunders roar and lightnings fly,
And a dread deluge whelms the angry sky,
Perchance the tempest rouses from the grove,
Mid myrtle-bowers, a silver-winged dove,
Far from her nest, 'mid Ether launched, she sails,
And in sad notes her cruel fate bewails.
When youthful Hope her gay perspective drew,
Of every form, and every rain-bow hue;

My mind ambitious soon the task began
 To mould Creation's Lord, and fashion Man ;
 To watch the features, glowing from the clay,
 Rise to my view and my behest obey !
 Yet is this man ? while all bedimmed bodies,
 Unflushed his cheek and unillumed his eyes !
 Oh ! for one beam of pure ethereal fire,
 The clay to warm, to animate, inspire. *
 No more ! but swift as flits the viewless breeze,
 And skims the bosom of the rippling seas,
 I gain the throne of Heaven's immortal Sire,
 Where flows the fountain of ethereal fire.
 Pure, vivid Light ! that woke primeval day,
 And over Chaos shed its genial ray ;
 Pure, vivid Light ! that bathed each twinkling star
 With golden beams, and pallid Cynthia's car
 With choicest silver graced, and bade her reign
 Supreme, the glory of the starry plain.
 In earth-born Man that ray divinely bright
 To Reason gave her pure unclouded light.

Methinks I view the fire within him glow,
 Thaw the chilled vein and bid the spirit flow,
 His eyes that stagger with unwonted light,
 And reel with sudden drunkenness of sight,
 He viewed around him all creation shine,
 "The earth," he cries, "the seas, the sky is mine,
 All, all, are mine !" he clasped his hands and said,
 "For me alone the universe is made."
 No more he uttered—bliss congealed his tongue,
 And from his eyes the tears of gladness sprung ;
 Sublime he reared his forehead to the skies,
 As Reason cried, "thy soul must upward rise ;"
 Thy soul still burning with a fond desire,
 To mix with Heaven, and join her kindred fire !
 As when a mother on her infant's face,
 Twined with her charms beholds the father's grace ;
 How mixed with smiles the tears of pleasure start !
 What soft sensations thrill her panting heart !
 Thus my fixed eye surveyed the blaze of light,
 That graced the brilliant dawn of human sight ;
 Gazed on the blush where the soul's beauty shone,
 And hailed the mighty wonder as my own !

I saw fair Nature, gladdening at the view,
 Robe all her beauties with a richer hue :
 When Man first spake, the birds around him hung
 To borrow notes from his melodious tongue :

His feet to lave, a gurgling fountain flowed ;
His touch to greet, a new-born blossom glowed :
Gales swept of harps unseen the trembling chord,
And Echo chaunted—" Hail Creation's Lord !"

But sorrow soon o'erwhelmed this gay serene,
And joy was banished from the gorgeous scene !
As when a cloud whose purpled tints display
The warm effulgence of retiring day,
Charms every eye—transports the wondering gaze
With all the hues that in its radiance blaze ;
But ah ! each tint by darkness is suppressed,
When Phœbus sinks on Ocean's liquid breast.

Arise, ye rocks ; ye oceans, intervene !
Divide my heart from the alluring scene !
Rage, rage, ye storms ; ye tempests, howl around
This rugged rock, and shake the accursed ground !
From your abyss ye phrensied Furies start !
My anger nerve, and blaze within my heart !

Arise ! and bear me to your dread abodes,
Where every pang the tortured soul corrodes !
Where Grief and Misery stalk with steely hands
To execute fierce Pluto's dire commands ;
Where Disappointment counts her tears, that flow
In unison with agonizing woe.

Shall I adore the Tyrant of the skies,
Bow my proud neck, and sue with downcast eyes ?
No ! sooner should fair Cynthia's pallid light
In Heaven dissolve amid the shades of night ;
Sooner should Darkness close the eye of day,
And Discord over all extend her sway.

E'en if the Tyrant should himself descend,
And 'neath his feet the firmament should bend,
While round his brow the storms and meteors fly,
And o'er him blaze the terrors of the sky ;
Though from his chariot-wheel the thunders roll,
That rock the deep and agitate the Pole ;
Though forests crash beneath his ponderous feet,
And seas retiring court a safe retreat ;
Though underneath him mountains crumbling fall,
And dreadful tremors shake the astonished Ball ;
Though all the storms of maddening Heaven be sped,
To crush these limbs, and blast this aching head ;
E'en should this globe 'mid chaos dark be hurled,
My mind shall reign unquelled amidst the bursting world !

JOHN ST. MAWE.

REMARKS

On the CAMBRIDGE MS. of the four GOSPELS, and the ACTS of the APOSTLES, marked D by WETSTEIN and GRIESBACH, in their Editions of the N. T. and commonly termed the CODÆX BEZÆ.

THE reader of the following pages is supposed to be well acquainted with the history of the *Codex Bezae*, as given by Michaelis in his Introduction to the N. T. and by Dr. Marsh in his Notes on that work;¹ and therefore I have not thought it necessary to delay him by repeating what has been already so ably performed. He is also, of course, supposed to be aware, that it has been accused, in company with F (the Cod. Augiensis,) G (the Cod. Boernerianus) and the Claromontanus (noted D in the 2nd part of Wetstein's N. T. and in Griesbach's 2nd Vol.) and several other Greek MSS., of representing a text corrupted from the Latin, or, as it is termed by critics, of *Latinizing*: and he is believed to know that this corruption has been denied, by Adler,² Griesbach,³ Dr. Kipling,⁴ Dr. Marsh,⁵ Michaelis,⁶ Dr. Semler,⁷ and Woide.⁸ The charge has been admitted by Matthäi, and Dr. Middleton,⁹ and perhaps by a few other modern critics: the early editors of the N. T. Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein,¹⁰ were unanimous in condemning the *Cod. Bezae*.

¹ Vol. II. Pt. I. pp. 228—242.

² Vol. II. Pt. II. pp. 679—721. I make use of the second Edit. 4 Vols. 8vo. London and Cambridge 1809. The first was printed in 1792, and is not so complete.

³ Verss. Syriacæ denuo examinatae. 4to. Havniæ, 1789. p. 91.

⁴ Symbolæ Criticæ Halæ. 1785. vol. I. p. cx. and Prolegom. ad N. T. vol. I. p. lxi. edit. 1796.

⁵ In the Preface to his edition of the Codex Bezae.

⁶ Notes to Michaelis ut supra.

⁷ Ut supra. (In the 4th edition of his *Einleitung in die Gottliche Schriften des Neuen Bundes*, Gottingen, 1788. [The work translated by Dr. Marsh,] for in the editions of 1750, 1765, and 1777, he agreed with Wetstein.)

⁸ Hermeneutische Vorberetung 12mo. Halle, 1764. vol. III. pp. 126—135.

⁹ Notitia Cod. Alexandrini. Sect. vi. pp. 120—166. ed. Spohn. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1788. He defends here, from the charge of Latinizing, not so much the *Cod. Bezae*, as the *Codd. Græco-Latini*, in general.

¹⁰ Appendix to The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the N. T. 8vo. 1808.

¹¹ Wetstein was the chief opponent of the *Codd. Græco-Latini*, and the person, through whose means they lost, for a long time, their credit.

It is the object of the following remarks, to show that the *Cod. Bezae* has been in some places corrupted from the Latin; though not to deny that it contains many valuable readings; to demonstrate, that the truth lies between the extremes of Wetstein's opinion on the one hand, and Dr. Semler's on the other: in short in this, as in most other similar cases, the Critic *medio tutissimus ibit*.

It may be right to acknowledge, that some apology should be made, for differing from so many critics of the first rank: but I trust that the examples to be brought forward will bear me out; and I shall not, I hope, be found obstinate in retaining any erroneous opinion which may be shown to be such: I must also seek refuge in the remark of a distinguished critic of our own country; that "the duty, which we owe to truth, is superior to that which can be claimed by the greatest names, or the most exalted characters." To make apologies, indeed, for appearing on such occasions, is generally of little avail; because they are seldom believed to be sincere: and it were far better ingenuously to come forward with the words of Pilate—ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.²

It is generally contended by the apologists of the *Cod. Bezae* that it does not Latinize, because it agrees with several ancient versions, in characteristic readings, and also in many, which as far as respects Greek MSS. are *lectiones singulares*. This fact I most willingly grant: but still in my view of the subject, it will not prove that the MS. does not Latinize. I do not regard as Latinisms all the readings in which, though it agrees with few Greek MSS. it coincides with many Latin authorities: nor would I rank in the same class those, in which the Greek text, differing from all the MSS. agrees alone with the Latin version annexed to the Greek text, and which Griesbach has denoted by the abbreviation, *Cant.*, because in many instances, perhaps in most, a single Latin copy may have been altered from its Greek text. The famous reading Matth. iii. 16. εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καταβαίνοντα, which has been termed³ an unhappy translation of the Latin, *spiritum Dei descendentem*, has been well explained by a conjecture of the learned Knittel,⁴ which, supposing it true, would rescue the passage from the charge of Latinizing: but the great

¹ Dr. Marsh's Preface to his Translation of Michaelis, p. ix.

² I should remark, that the readings I have selected are given on the authority of Griesbach's edition of the N. T. the only collection of various readings to which I at present have access. The references given to the Symbol. Crit. and Semler's Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, I make on the authority of Adler and Dr. Marsh.

³ See Marsh's Michaelis. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 230.

⁴ Ulphilæ Vers. Gothica nonnullor. cap. epistolæ ad Romanos, p. 283. Upsaliæ, 1768. or Dr. Marsh's Notes on Michaelis, Vol. II. Pt. ii. p. 683.

objection is, that in the very same verse the Cod. Bezae has a reading which appears very suspicious: namely, after καταβαίνοντα, it adds, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; an addition found only in Cant.¹ *veron. germ.* 1. 2. *clar. gat. Mm. Hilar. Auct. de promiss.* In the very next verse too, we have, πρὸς αὐτὸν, σὺ εἶ in D. *ad eum; tu es*, Cant. *verc. ad eum: hic est.* *veron. germ. clar.*, for οὗτός ἐστιν. Were these readings single, they would not perhaps prove much, but occurring altogether in the space of two verses, the conclusion is infinitely stronger.² Michaelis objects,³ that “a transcriber, who designedly made this alteration, must have been sufficiently acquainted with the Greek Grammar to know the difference between the masculine καταβαίνοντα, and the neuter καταβαῖνον, and at the same time so ignorant as not to know that πνεῦμα was a neuter.” It cannot be denied that this objection is of great importance: but the ignorance of the writer of the Cod. D. has led him into declining, at Matt. ii. 1., Ἡρώδης like Δημοσθένης; and at ix. 36. he has formed the Preterite of πίπτω like that of τύπτω.⁴ Of such a man, it is not very difficult to believe the rest.

That the Cod. D. agrees in very many readings with the Peshito or old Syriac version, and with the readings in the margin of the Philoxenian or Heracleian Syriac, as well as with the Coptic printed by Wilkins, and the Sahidic published by Woide, is a fact very consistent with our hypothesis. Being a very ancient MS. and containing a text much older than itself, it will, of course, contain a great number of valuable readings, or at least many which are found in those authorities. But still, the Cod. Bezae has a great number of readings which are peculiar to itself, and to the old Latin versions, or which are found only in them and in the Armenian version, which, it is notorious, has been once, if not twice, corrected or corrupted from the Latin.⁵ It has indeed been denied by Dr. Griesbach,⁶ that the Armenian does Latinize, because it often agrees with the quotations of Origen: Michaelis, however, [replies,⁷ that, “not to mention that the Latin version itself coincides with Origen in many important readings, it cannot be inferred from the coincidence even of a

¹ I use the abbreviations employed by Griesbach.

² Middleton, p. 691.

³ *Introd.* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 230.

⁴ For these instances I am indebted to Dr. Middleton, p. 686: Griesbach, who generally quotes only the readings which make some alteration in the sense, has not noticed them.

⁵ Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 102. This correction undoubtedly took place about the year 1250, in the time of Haitho, or rather Hethom: the second is supposed to have been made by Uschan, Bishop of Erivan, when he printed the version at Amsterdam in 1666.

⁶ *Symb. Crit.* T. i. p. 77.

⁷ *Introd.* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 103.

great number of examples that Hethom made no alterations:" to this it may be added, that probably the readings it has in common with Origen existed before the time of Haitho. That he left many ancient readings in the Armenian text, is highly probable, from the circumstance, that it still has *Jesus Barabbas* in Matth. xxvii. 16, 17. an addition found in three MSS. and the Jerusalem Syriac, and some few copies of Origen (*Hom. xxxv. in Mult.*) besides the scholia attached to many MSS. and which is countenanced by an ancient tradition of the Syrian church.¹ This reading is found in no Latin MS. On the other hand, he had the imprudence to interpolate 1 John v. 7., which, whether it be genuine or not, certainly never formed a part, either of the Armenian or any other oriental version.—At the same time, it should be confessed, that the Arm. seldom agrees with D, where its reading is supported only by the Latin authorities.

Dr. Middleton in his Appendix has given a very useful collation of the Cod. Bezae in Matt. v—xii. and as a supplement to what he has done I offer to the reader the following collation of the remainder of the book. I have confined myself to instances, in which D agrees with Latin authorities only; to instances of agreement between D, the Latin versions, and the Armenian; to readings found only in D. Cant.; and *lectiones singulares* of D.—I have omitted several readings, which, according to Griesbach, belong to the above classes, because I have carefully compared my whole collation, with the Coptic and Sahidic versions, and found several instances in which they supported the Latin readings, though Griesbach has omitted to note their evidence: and I have made it a rule to produce none which do not fall strictly under the foregoing heads.—Griesbach's notation of the authorities has been followed: the mark + denotes the addition of a word or sentence; and = the omission.

Matthew xiii. 1. ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας] = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. 2. || xiii. 13. αὐτοῖς λαλῶ] λαλεῖ αὐτοῖς D* ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς D** || xiii. 14. λέγουσα] + περιέβητι, καὶ εἰπὲ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. D. cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. colb. germ. 1. alii. || xiii. 17. εἶδον] ἰδούθησαν ἰδεῖν D. cant. || xiii. 23. ὃς δὲ] τότε. D. cant. verc. veron. colb. clar. || xiii. 49. αἰῶνος] κόσμου D. || xiv. 2. αὐτοῦ] + μήτι D. (St. β.)² cant. veron. brix. clar. germ. 2. Mm. gat. || xiv. 3. Φιλίππου] = D. Vulg. cant. verc. corb. germ. 1. colb. for. || xiv. 8. ἐπὶ πίνακι] = D. cant. || xiv. 14. αὐτοῖς] περὶ αὐτῶν. D. ||

¹ See Adler, Verss. Syr. p. 172, or the Class. Journal, Vol. ix. p. 225. No. XVII.

² The Cod. Stephani β. is no other than the Cod. Bezae. See Marsh's Michaelis Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 236. Pt. ii. p. 688. sqq.

πν. 11. κοῖνοι] κοινωνεῖ. D.*¹ *communicat* Cant.* colb. (*semel.*) Tert. Hier. Aug. *Sic bis et vs.* 18, 20. || xv. 14. αὐτοῦς] τοὺς τυφλοὺς. D. cant. || xv. 22. αὐτῷ] ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ. D. cant. || xv. 24. πρόβατα] + ταῦτα. D. cant. || xvi. 2. αὐτοῖς] = D. cant. *verc.* colb. germ. 1. || xvi. 4. καὶ μοιχαλῖς] = D. cant. *verc.* corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. Prosper. || xvi. 5. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ] *Post* ἐπελάθοντο *ponunt* D. It. (*exc.* brix. germ. 2. for. et gat.) || xvi. 16. ζῶντος] σῶζοντος D.* cant.* || xvii. 1. Καὶ prius] + ἐγένετο. D. It. (*exc.* brix. for.*²) || κατ' ἰδίαν] λίαν D. cant. || xvii. 12. οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν] *In finem commat.* 13. *rejiciunt* D. cant. *verc.* *veron.* corb. 1. 2. colb. germ. 1.³ || xvii. 25. ὅτε εἰσῃλθεν] εἰσέλθοντι D. || xviii. 16.

¹ Could this error have arisen in the Greek? The following conjecture appears to account for it. Κοινῶν sometimes means *communico*, e. g. Φέρε, κοινωνῶν μῦθον εἰς ἡμᾶς Eur. Iph. in Aul. 44. but in this place it signifies *inquino*, *polluo*. The old Latin translators rendered it here, improperly, by *communico*: the transcriber, or rather the compiler of the *Cod. Beza*, consulted the Latin vers. and, without any further consideration, altered κοῖνοι to κοινωνεῖ, which never means *polluo*.

² For the *Cod. Forojuliensis*, an ancient Latin MS. printed by Blanchini in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Romæ*, 1749, contains merely the corrected text of Jerome, and does not belong to the old Latin version: ἐγένετο, is therefore the reading of all the MSS. of what is termed the *Italic* version, with the exception of the *Cod. Brixianus*. See Marsh's *Michaelis* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 109. and Dobrowsky, *Fragment. Pragense Evangel. Marci*. Prag. 1788.

³ How can this transposition be accounted for? I have not access to any of the old verss. published by Blanchini; but from the reading of the Vulg. I am induced to offer the following conjecture. The passage in that vers. is thus worded: *Sic et filius hominis passurus est ab eis*: and the final clause of the 13th verse, περὶ Ἰωάννου—εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, is rendered; *de Johanne—dixisset eis*. Now the transcriber of the Lat. MS. from which the others were transcribed after he had written to *voluturunt*, by which ἤβλησαν is rendered, cast his eye on the 13th verse and wrote as far as *dixisset eis*: on examining his transcript he perceived his mistake, and added in the margin the words he had omitted in v. 12: subsequent transcribers admitted this marginal addition into the text, but in the wrong place. From one of these copies the *Cod. Beza* was corrected.—If it should be objected, that the transposition makes absolute and incorrigible nonsense of the passage, and that therefore the *Cod. Beza* would hardly have been so corrected; it may be replied, that the correction might as well be made there, as the transposition occur in the Lat. MSS., the transcribers of which seem to have understood what they wrote, and would therefore, it might be thought, equally perceive the absurdity. Besides we have sufficient proof, that the writer of the *Cod. D.* was, as Wetstein says, “καλλιγραφίας, quàm vel Græce vel Latine literarum peritor.” Indeed, the conjecture of Knittel to explain the reading Matt. iii. 16. supposes a great want, both of accuracy and of knowledge.—The transposition could not have arisen from an *homoteleuton* in the Greek; because there we have αὐτῶν and αὐτοῖς. The question might have been examined with greater certainty, had I had the use of the *Evangeliarium* of Blanchini: but if the conjecture be grounded, it is, I

= D. Cant. Aug. *semel*. In aliis locum mutat. || xviii. 25. ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ] αὐτοῦ = D. Cant. *verc.* for. germ. 2. harl. *emmer*. Hier. Lucifer. || xviii. 26. σοὶ] = D. Cant. *veron. corb.* 1. 3. || xviii. 33. οὐκ ἔδει] + οὖν D. Arm. Vulg. It. (*exc. for.*) Aug. || xix. 1. ἐτέλεσεν] ἐλάλησεν D. It. (*exc. brix. germ. 2. clar. Mm. for.*) Hilar. || xix. 10. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] τοῦ ἀνδρός D. Arm. (*ut videtur*) VIRI, It. (*exc. brix. for. germ. 2.*) Amb. Op. imp. Ambrosiast. || xix. 25. ἐξεπλήσσοντο] + καὶ ἐφθρήθησαν D. Cant. *verc. veron. corb.* germ. 2. Mm. *corb.* 2. Hilar. || xix. 29. ἡ πατέρα] = D. Cant. *veron. corb.* 1. 2. Hilar. Paulin. || xx. 10. πλείονα] πλείω D. || xx. 28. πολλῶν.] + ² ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι, καὶ ἐκ μείζονος

should conceive, an irrefragable proof, that the *Cod. Beza* does latinize, at least in some instances.

¹ The difference between the two readings is greater than may appear at the first view: *ἀνδραποῦς* signifying a man generally, like the Latin *homo*; while *ἀνὴρ* means a husband, as the Latin *vir*.

² This is a very long interpolation, though not, as will be shown, a singular one, in the *Cod. Beza*. It does not seem likely to have taken its rise in the Greek. I. The Italic version, (in all the MSS. of which it is found, with little variation,) certainly existed at a period considerably prior to the *Cod. Beza*, even allowing to that MS. the greatest antiquity for which its advocates contend. II. The Latin versions made before the time of Jerome fell into great confusion, on account of the liberties taken with them by transcribers, who, as we are told by St. Jerome, (as quoted by Michaelis, *Introd.* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 119.) made, rather *harmonies* of the Gospels, than *transcripts* of them: hence, this passage was probably interpolated from Luke xiv. 8. sqq. though evidently in the wrong place. From hence I conceive it to have been admitted into the *Cod. Beza*: the transcriber of which, being a member of the western church, probably thought he really improved the text by so doing. If we consider the attachment which Augustine (a man of more information probably, and who therefore was more likely to entertain moderate opinions, than the writer, or rather the compiler of the *Cod. Beza*.) showed to the old Italic version, by entertaining a great jealousy of Jerome's endeavours to amend it; we can hardly be surprised, that the writer of our Codex should think the version paramount to the text, and should now and then correct the latter by the former. III. If we translate closely, the old Lat. vers. into Greek, we shall have exactly the reading of the *Cod. Cantabrigiensis*: and we have seen already in *Matth.* xv. 11. and xvii. 12. some readings which look very like retranlations. IV. This reading seems to have extended very widely into the old Lat. vers. because we find it in the Anglo-Saxon vers. which according to Michaelis (*Introd.* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 158.) was made from the old Lat. and not from the Vulg. V. Had this addition arisen in the Greek, we should have expected to find it in some other Gr. MSS. at least in some one of those which harmonize with the *Cod. D.*; but it is found in the *Cod. Beza* alone. VI. It is true that the same addition is found in the margin of one MS. of the Philoxenian version; (see the Syriac text in Adler's *Verss. Syr.* p. 90.) and that it is there said to have been found in *exemplis Græcis*. (ܡܫܬܬܐ ܡܕܢܚܐ) There is, however, reason to think that the *Cod. D.* was one of the MSS. used by Thomas of Harkel, the Editor of the vers. when he collated it with Greek

ἀπὸ τῶν εἶναι εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ, καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι, μὴ ἀνακλι-
νῆσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ, καὶ προσ-
ελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι, ἔτι κάτω χώρει· καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ.
ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον, καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σοῦ ἥττωι, ἔρεϊ σοὶ ὁ
δειπνοκλήτωρ· σὺναγε ἔτι ἄνω· καὶ ἔσται σοὶ τοῦτο χρήσιμον. D. *Vos
quidem quæritis de minimo* (pusillo verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1.
colb. clar. Leo M. modico emmer.) *crescere, et de magno* (maximo
emmer.) *minui, (et de majore minores fieri s. esse verc. corb. 1. 2.
colb. clar. Leo M. Juv. et de minore majores fieri s. esse veron.
germ. 1. et de magnis majores esse cod. S. Andreæ secus Avenio-
nam. Leo M. alicubi) Introcuntes* (intranτες verc. veron. alii)
autem et rogati cœnare (ad cœnam verc. veron. alii) *ne discubueri-
tis* (nolite recumbere) *in eminentibus* (superioribus) *locis, ne forte
dignior* (clarior) *te superveniat et accedens cœnæ invitator* (qui ad
cœnam vocavit te) *dicat tibi: adhuc deorsum* (inferius) *accede; et
confundaris* (et erit tibi confusio.) *Si autem discubueris in mini-
mum locum, (in loco inferiori) et superveniat minor* (humilior) *te,
dicet tibi invitator cœnæ* (qui ad cœnam vocavit te) *collige adhuc
superius, (accede adhuc sursum, s. superius) et erit tibi hoc utile*
(utilius). Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. 2. colb. clar.
emmer. Alii Codd. latt. 5. apud WETST. Vers. Sax. Cod.
Syræ. p. ASSEMANNI 1. in marg. (hac addita nota: “hæc quidem
in exemplis antiquis [sc. Syriacis] in Luca tantum leguntur cap.
53.; inveniuntur autem in exemplis græcis hoc loco, quamobrem
nos ea hic apposuimus.”) Hilar. Leo M. Juv. || germ. 1. non habet
partem posteriorem; INTROEUNTES; contra vero germ. 2. et
Hilar. omittunt partem additamenti priorem. || xxi. 7. ἐπάνω αὐτῶν]
ἐπ’ αὐτόν. D. Cant. verc. veron. brix. corb. 1. 2. clar. vulg. ms.
Origen ms. scmel. Op. imp. Juv. || ἐπεκρίθησαν] ἐκάρητο D. || xxi. 18.
ἐπανόγων] παράγων.] D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. colb.
clar. Hilar. || xxi. 24. ὅν] = D.* cant. corb. colb. clar. || xxi. 32.

MSS. in the library of Alexandria: (see Adler *Verss. Syr.* p. 150. and his
remarks p. 133.) and this is not a little corroborated by the circumstance,
that the *Cod. Cant.* and the margin of the *Philox. Syr.* contain the readings
of the Alexandrine edition. But after all, it is not certain that Thomas of
Harkel found it in EXEMPLIS GRÆCIS, or that he meant to express the plural;
since the Syriac words being written without vowel points, will express in
EXEMPLO GRÆCO if the Ribbui be discarded, and they be read ܡܬܝܢ ܡܝܬܝܢ:

this Adler himself remarks. (p. 91. note 39.) The testimony of the *Philox.*
vers. therefore, will not prove the *Cod. D.* not to have been interpolated
from the Latin. VII. Matthæi thinks it arose from a scholion in some
Greek copy: but to this it may be objected, that the practice of writing
scholia in Gr. MSS. hardly commenced so very early, as this reading must
have existed, which obtained a most complete possession of all the MSS. of
the old Lat. vers. If all this be considered, we shall hardly think that this
reading arose in the Greek.

οὐ] = D. Cant. (colb. *videntes hæc, pœnit. Sed videntes, met pœnit. ceteri latt.*) || xxi. 39. ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, καὶ ἀνέκτειναν] ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπ. D. Cant. veron. verc. clar. corb. 2. colb. Mm. Sax. Lucif. Juv. || xxii. 5. ὁ μὲν—ὁ δὲ] εἰ, et postea αὐτῶν D. Cant. veron. colb. corb. 2. clar. Iren. Lucif. || xxii. 7. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς] ἐκείνος* βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας D. Cant. veron. Lucifer. item (addito *autem*) verc. colb. corb. 2. || xxii. 13. δῆσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἄρατε αὐτόν] ἄρατε αὐτὸν ποδῶν καὶ χειρῶν καὶ βάλετε αὐτὸν (omisso δῆσαντες) D. Cant. verc. veron. colb. corb. 2. clar. Iren. Hilar. semel. Lucif. Donat. in collat. cuthag. *Tollite eum ligatis pedibus et manibus et mittite eum*, corb. 1. Ambrosiast. Hier. Victor. tun. || xxii. 15. ὅπως] πῶς D. Cant. brix. || xxii. 17. Εἶπε οὖν ἡμῖν] = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. || xxii. 37. Ἰησοῦς] post αὐτῶν ponit D. Vulg. It. || xxiii. 34. πρὸς ὑμᾶς] = D. Cant. || xxiv. 17. αὐτοῦ] = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 2. Cypr. Iren. Hilar. Op. imp. || xxiv. 24. πλανῆσαι] πλανηθῆναι D. Vulg. for. veron. germ. 1. Cypr. *seducantur* . . . *electos*, Cant. || xxiv. 30. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ] τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς D. Cant. || xxv. 20. ἐκέρδησα] ἐπεκέρδησα D. Vulg. It. || xxv. 21. ἐπὶ πρίν] ἐπεὶ ἐπ' (etiam vs. 23.) D. Arm. Vulg. It. Patr. latt. || xxv. 28. δέκα] πέντε D. Cant. *quæ quinque duplicavit*. Hilar. || xxvi. 55. ἐξήλθετε] ἦλθατε D. It. exc. corb. 1. germ. 1. brix. || xxvi. 60. πολλῶν ψευδομαρτύρων προσελθόντων οὐχ εὖρον] τὸ ἐξῆς. καὶ πολλοὶ προσῆλθον ψευδομάρτυρες, καὶ οὐχ εὖρον, τὸ ἐξῆς. D. *sequentia. Et multi accesserunt falsi testes, et non invenerunt rei sequentia* (f. 1. *reum, sequentia*) Cant. || οὐχ εὖρον prius] *non invenerunt exitum*, corb. 2. *non inv. exitum rei* clar. || οὐχ εὖρον posterius] *non invenerunt culpam* brix. *non inven. quicquam in eo s. in eum*. colb. corb. 2. clar. *non inv. exitum rei*. verc. || xxvi. 71. ἄλλη] + παιδίσκη. D. Vulg. veron. verc. colb. corb. 2. clar. Mm. gat. + γυνὴ τις Arm. || xxvi. 79. δῆλον σὲ πειεῖ] ὁμοιάζει. D. veron. verc. clar. colb. corb. 2. || xxvii. 1. ἔλαβον] ἐποίησαν. D. Verc. brix. colb. gat. || xxvii. 32. κυρῆναιον] + εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ. D. Sax. cant. veron. verc. colb. clar. corb. 2. gat. Mm. germ. 2. luxon. harl. || xxvii. 66. τῆς κουστωδίας] φύλακας et τῶν φυλάκων. D.* cant. veron. verc. brix. colb. germ. 1. corb. 2. foroj. Aug. || xxviii. 7. ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν] = D. Arm. Vulg. It. (exc. brix. foroj. colb. corb. 2. germ. 2. gat.)

The above collation contains the chief readings in which the *Cod. Beza* differs from the received text, either alone, or accompanied with other Latin authorities. It would be too much to assert, that all the readings above quoted, or even the major part of them, owe their origin to the influence of the Latin; nor has this been assumed: but that some do, cannot, I think, easily be doubted.

The *Cod. Beza*, sometimes, though not frequently, departs

the received text, in company with the Persic version printed in the London Polyglott, either singly, or in company with the Latin. At the first view, it may appear extremely improbable that the Persic should have been altered from the Latin, particularly when Michaelis,¹ with some other learned critics, have contended that it was translated from the Syriac. If we had no other extracts from this version but such as have been given by Griesbach, it might, perhaps, be difficult to bring home the charge: but Dr. Adam Clarke, a writer distinguished by his knowledge of the Persian language, has given in the General Introduction to the N. T. prefixed to his edition of the Bible with notes,² a very ample account of this version, from which I am able to give the following instances. It will be clearly seen that it was made by a *Roman Catholic*, who has even falsified the text to support his doctrines. E. g. *mitigation* of punishment is promised to Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment: Matt. xi. 22. "Now I say unto you, that in the day of judgment, to Tyre and Sidon, there shall be **REPOSE**, which shall not be to you:" there is a Catholic saying about Hell: Mark ix. 46. the words, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," in the Persic is translated by, "*because from thence liberation is impossible:*" *Prayer* for the dead is noticed in Luke, vii. 12. "he saw a dead man, whom they were carrying out with **PRAYER** and lamentation:" the *merit* of good works, for the *purchase* of the remission of sins is taught Luke vii. 47. and xvi. 9. "as a **RECOMPENSE** for what she has done, her sins which are many, are forgiven, for that very cause that she was worthy of much, or, has much merit: but little shall be forgiven to him who has little merit:" the doctrine of *supererogation* is glanced at, Luke xix. 9. "Jesus said,—to-day—there is a great salvation to this house, *because* this man is of the sons of Abraham:" and the *merit* of *martyrdom* is spoken of Matt. xxvii. 52. "the bodies of many saints who had suffered **MARTYRDOM** rose." That a translator of this kind employed the Latin version, is almost a thing of course: and Dr. C. after attentively reading the version *twice*, is of opinion that it was made directly from the Vulgate: but this will not agree with a phenomenon mentioned by Michaelis,³ that Syriac words are retained and a Persic interpretation added. However, allowing that it was made from the Syriac, still it might have been corrected in some measure from the Vulgate: for we read that Hebedjesu Bishop of Sigara, who lived in the year 1295, went to Rome to abjure Nestorianism:⁴ and

¹ Introduction Vol. II. Pt. 1. p. 105.

² Page 17.

³ Introd. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 105.

⁴ See Echellensis Prefat. ad Hebedjesu Catalog. Lib. Chaldeorum, p. 4. Romæ, 1653. or the Class. Journal, Vol. ix. p. 189.

of the four Gospels, &c.

it was about this time, that the Persian version probably was made, or a little before it: Dr. C. places it in 1341. This sufficiently establishes the fact, that an ecclesiastical intercourse between the members of the Roman and Arabian Churches of that period subsisted. These premises being established, the inference follows of course.

The object of the present essay, however, is not so much to prove the corruption of the Cod. D. from the Latin in particular, as its actual corruption from some source or other. That the MS. contains many readings peculiar to itself, and also abounds with additions, is a fact well-known and admitted, even by its warmest advocates: thus for example, besides the remarkable addition noticed above in the collation on Matt. xx. 28., it contains several more, equally remarkable: it would take up too much time, as well as paper, to cite them at full length; and I shall therefore content myself with referring the reader to Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament under the following passages: Luke ii. 39; iv. 31; xi. 2, 30; xxiii. 54; xxiv. 1. John vi. 56; xii. 28; xvii. 11. Act. Apost. vi. 11; xv. 29; xvii. 15. These examples I have collected by merely turning over the leaves of Griesbach: I have observed many more at different times; but, as I neglected to note the passages, I cannot give more instances: these, however, will be quite sufficient for any reader who will take the trouble attentively to consider them.

The true opinion respecting this MS., therefore, seems to be as follows: the original MS. which formed the basis of our Codex, was of the Alexandrine edition; and contained the valuable readings which we find in that edition: this fell into the hands of some member of the Western Church, who, entertaining a high opinion of the Latin version, noted in the margin, in Greek, many of its readings: it was afterwards transcribed by some one, who added a Latin version, and received into the Greek the various readings noted by his former possessor; to these he added a few scholia, which he found in the margin of that or some other MS.; and being, as Wetstein says, more skilled in calligraphy than in Greek, he added some blunders of his own. This is probably a true sketch of the history of this MS.; and will account for its frequent coincidence with the three Egyptian versions, with the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and with the MSS. of the Alexandrine

"Notissimum est," says Dr. Kipling, the learned editor of the MS., "*Bezae Codicis Textum non modo scholiis hic illic fedari, verum etiam spuris quibusdam amplificari, &c.*" Præfat. p. 5. See also Michaelis, Introd. Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 235. though he does not admit that it Latinizes.

edition. Michaelis himself insists,¹ that it is a Codex eclecticus, and that "the transcriber," (he should have said the possessor, for the writer could not easily have made, himself, the variations found in the MS., being too ignorant,)—"acted like a critic, and corrected the text from the best helps which he could procure, and derived assistance from many ancient MSS., some of which had admitted scholia into the text, and at times to have ventured a critical conjecture." This being the case, if the corrector was a member of the Western Church, he might, and probably would, use the Italic version as an assistance. Dr. Marsh, indeed, thinks,² that "if so eminent a critic as Wetstein had not advanced the opinion, it would seem absurd, where the Greek occupies the first page, the Latin the second, and the latter is annexed to the former, as a mean of understanding it, to imagine that the readings of the original were adapted to those of the translation." But why may not the Latin have been used also as a critical *subsidiū*? If, as Dr. M. believes,³ the reason, why the Cod. D. so frequently agrees with the Latin, be, that the MSS. from which the Latin versions were made, come nearer to it in point of time, than to those Greek MSS. from which the Codex Bezae differs: if the authors of these Latin versions found in the Greek MSS. from which they translated, the readings which are common to them, and to the Cod. Bezae: if this very agreement, instead of showing these readings to be spurious, is a strong argument that they are ancient and genuine: then must we without hesitation receive into our Greek text the addition at Matt. xx. 28., though evidently in the wrong place, because it is supported by a great majority of the Latin authorities. But Jerome assures us that the Italic version was much corrupted; and therefore it is more reasonable to think that it did not exist in the Latin version when first made, but was afterwards admitted into it, and got admittance into the Cod. Bezae, in the manner I conjectured in the notes to that part of the collation.

Dr. Middleton confined his extracts to the first 12 chapters of St. Matthew; the most unprolific chapters of the most unprolific book; for the Cod. Bezae has, in the Gospel of St. Matthew, fewer readings in proportion, than in any other of the books which it contains: and even in the short portion which he collated, there is a chasm of nearly three chapters. Had he selected the other part of the Evangelist, namely, that which I have here examined, he would have made the strength of his cause much more apparent. To a reader, however, who is disposed to examine more minutely

¹ Introd. Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 235.

² Notes to Michaelis, Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 668.

³ Ut supra.

the readings of this MS., I would recommend the Acts of the Apostles, where he will find abundant materials for his consideration.

What has been said does not much affect the other MSS., which have been generally accused of Leningizing; because the passages of that nature in them are but few; nor do they so abound with interpolations. In these respects the Cod. Bezae differs from all other MSS.; nor is it easy, if the Cod. Bezae be absolved from the charge, and its readings be esteemed valuable, to defend the others. In proportion as we extol the Cambridge MS. we diminish the authority of the multitude which dissent from it.

August 18, 1815.



MEMOIR ON THE RUINS OF BABYLON;

By CLAUDIUS JAMES RICH, Esq. Resident for the
Honorable East India Company at the Court of the
Pasha of Bagdad. With three plates. 8vo. London,
1815. Longman and Co.



To the ingenious author of this work we acknowledge ourselves considerably indebted for information on a subject, which, although interesting in the highest degree, seems, amidst the various pursuits of antiquarian travellers, to have been most unaccountably neglected. Perhaps the dangers attending any researches among ruins in the East have induced unprotected visitors to leave the Babylonian remains in full possession of barbarian tribes; but Mr. Rich's official character, as the East India Company's Resident at Bagdad, enabled him during the month of May, 1812, to explore with ease and safety those monuments of remote ages, in company with Mr. Lockett, to whom (p. 3.) he expresses his obligations for the measurements on which was constructed a map or sketch of the Babylonian territory, illustrating this memoir. "From the accounts of modern travellers," says Mr. Rich, "I had expected to have found on the site of Babylon

* Captain Lockett's elaborate work on Arabic Grammar, in a quarto volume, issued from the Calcutta press during last year: and this gentleman is now, we understand, in England, preparing for publication the account of his travels and Babylonian researches, which was announced in a former number of this Journal. See vol. viii. No. xv. p. 22

more, and less, than I actually did: less, because I could have formed no conception of the prodigious extent of the whole ruins, or of the size, solidity, and perfect state of some of the parts of them: and more, because I thought that I should have distinguished some traces, however imperfect, of many of the principal structures of Babylon. I imagined I should have said, 'Here were the walls; and such must have been the extent of the area. There stood the palace; and this most assuredly was the tower of Belus.' I was completely deceived: instead of a few insulated mounds, I found the whole face of the country covered with vestiges of buildings; in some places consisting of brick walls, surprisingly fresh—in others merely of a vast succession of mounds of rubbish of such indeterminate figures, variety, and extent, as to involve the person who should have formed any theory in insurmountable confusion.—(p. 2.) Mr. Rich considers the site of Babylon (p. 4.) as sufficiently established in the environs of Hellah, according to Major Rennell's excellent "Geography of Herodotus," a work which he notices with due praise.

The general direction of the road between Baghdad and Hellah, (a meanly-built town, containing six or seven thousand inhabitants) is North and South; the distance about forty-eight miles—and the whole intermediate country (with the exception of some few spots) a perfectly flat and uncultivated waste.—(pp. 4-8.) But the traces of former population are still numerous;—the plain is intersected by various canals, now neglected; and exhibits many piles of earth containing fragments of brick and tiles. Through this plain once ran the famous *Naher Malcha*, or *fluvius regius*, a work attributed to Nebuchadnezzar; it is now dry, like other streams that once flowed here, and served for the purposes of irrigation. Not far from the *Naher Malcha* is a ruined bridge over a small canal:—"Some time ago," says Mr. R., "a large lion came regularly every evening from the banks of the Euphrates, and took his stand on this bridge, to the terror of the traveller; he was at last shot by a Zobeide Arab."—(p. 5.) The ruins of Babylon may be said to commence at Mohawil; about nine miles from Hellah; the interjacent space exhibiting vestiges of buildings, burnt and unburnt bricks, and bitumen; also three mounds, of which the magnitude attracts particular attention. "Mr. R. found the Euphrates to be four hundred and fifty feet in breadth at the bridge of Hellah, and in depth two fathoms and a half. When it rises to its full height the adjoining country is inundated, and many parts of the Babylonian ruins are rendered inaccessible.—(p. 13.) The woods and coppices, mentioned by some travellers, no longer appear; and our author, not having seen the French work of M. Otter, is inclined to believe, "that the word *coppice* must exist only in the translation, as it is an improper term, the only wood being the date gardens of Hellah; to which certainly the word *coppice* will not apply."—(p. 16.) We find, however, on referring to the original, (*Voyage en Turquie, &c.* tome ii. p. 211.) that M. Otter's expression sufficiently authorizes this translation: his words are, "Les Géorgins de Turquie disent que Hellah, la grande du monde, est au sud de Bagdad—aujourd'hui on n'y

voit qu'un bois taillé." Mr. Rich assures us, that, among the ruins of Babylon, there remains but one tree; that, however, is of venerable antiquity, and was once of considerable size. "It is an ever-green, something resembling the *lignum vite*, and of a kind, I believe, not common in this part of the country, though I am told there is a tree of the same description at Bassora."—(p. 27.)

Without the engraved plan or map it would be almost useless, in this brief notice, to mention the particular directions or dimensions of all the canals, the mounds or masses of ruined buildings, the embankment skirting the river on its eastern side, the boundary line, and other things dividing the whole area, of which our author traces the extent. "The ruins," he observes in p. 20., "consist of mounds of earth, formed by the decomposition of building, channelled and furrowed by the waters, and the surface of them strewed with pieces of brick, bitumen, and pottery." Not far from the place called *Juglama*, is the first great mass of ruins; in length eleven hundred yards, and in greatest breadth eight hundred; its height above the general level of the plain being fifty or sixty feet.—(p. 21.) Another heap of ruins (p. 22.) is nearly seven hundred yards in length and breadth, and appears to have been composed of buildings far superior to all the rest, which have left traces in the eastern quarter. Both these heaps are magazines of bricks, whence the neighbouring inhabitants derive inexhaustible supplies. In excavations made for the purpose of extracting bricks, ancient walls have been discovered, with fragments of alabaster vessels, fine pottery, marble, and glazed tiles. Mr. R. found a sepulchral urn of earthen ware, and some human bones; (p. 23.) and not far from this, the figure which M. Beauchamp (as quoted by Major Rennell) had imperfectly seen, and understood from the Arabs to be an idol. "It was a lion of colossal dimensions, standing on a pedestal, of a coarse kind of grey granite, and of rude workmanship; in the mouth was a circular aperture, into which a man might introduce his fist." (p. 25.) The next remarkable object is the *Kasr*, or palace; its walls are formed of such well burnt brick, laid in line cement so precious, that the workmen employed to extract bricks have ceased their labor on account of the extreme difficulty. (p. 28.) The embankment on the river's side is abrupt and perpendicular; at the foot of it are found urns filled with human bones.—(p. 28.) One mile north of the *Kasr* (and five miles distant from Hellah) is the ruin which Pietro della Valle supposed to have been the Tower of Belus; an opinion adopted by Major Rennell. This the Arabs call *Mutalibè*, (p. 28.) or, according to the vulgar pronunciation, *Mujelibè*; a name which signifies *overturned*. (p. 28.) Its elevation at the highest angle is one hundred and forty-one feet, and its longest side extends two hundred yards. Those who dig into this heap find whole bricks with inscriptions, and innumerable fragments of pottery, "broken, pebbles, vitrified brick or scorin, and even shells, bits of glass, and mother of pearl; on asking a Turk how he imagined these latter substances were brought there, he replied, without the least hesitation, 'By the deluge.'"—(p. 29.) Here also are the dens of wild beasts; and here,

for a curious coincidence, Mr. Rich first heard the oriental account of Satyrs:—for in this desert it is said that the Arabs find an animal resembling a man from the head to the waist, but having the thighs and legs of a sheep or goat, and that they hunt this creature with dogs, and eat the lower part, abstaining from the upper, in which consists the resemblance to the human species. Mr. Rich here appositely quotes from Isaiah (ch. xiii. v. 21.) the prophetic passage—"But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and Satyrs shall dance there."—(p. 30.) He offers also (in the same page) some remarks on the Hebrew word שַׁיִר, here translated *Satyrs*. The limits of this notice will not allow us to communicate, at present, some thoughts suggested by this word. In a future number of the *Classical Journal* we shall perhaps recall the attention of our readers to Mr. Rich's observations: and proceed meanwhile to the account of his entertaining discovery. Having heard that some marble and a coffin of mulberry wood, with a human body, had been discovered in the Mugelibè, Mr. R. employed twelve men to dig there, and found a shaft or hollow pier, sixty feet square, in which were a brass spike, some earthen vessels, and a beam of date tree wood; they found in another part burnt bricks with inscriptions, and a wooden coffin, containing a well-preserved skeleton. "Under the head of the coffin was a round pebble; attached to the coffin, on the outside, a brass bird, and inside an ornament of the same material." Near the coffin lay the skeleton of a child.—(p. 33.)

Such are the principal ruins on the eastern side. The western affords only two small mounds of earth, at a place called *Anana*.—(p. 34.) But six miles south-west of Hella, stands the most stupendous remnant of ancient Babylon; entitled by the Arabs, *Birs Nemroud*, and by the Jews, *Nebuchadnezzar's Prison*. Mr. Rich has so well described his first view of this interesting ruin, that we shall gratify our readers by quoting his own words. "I visited the *Birs* under circumstances peculiarly favorable to the grandeur of its effect. The morning was at first stormy and threatened a severe fall of rain; but as we approached the object of our journey, the heavy clouds separating, discovered the *Birs* frowning over the plain, and presenting the appearance of a circular hill, crowned by a tower, with a high ridge extending along the foot of it. Its being entirely concealed from our view during the first part of our ride, prevented our acquiring the gradual idea, in general so prejudicial to effect, and so particularly lamented by those who visit the Pyramids. Just as we were within the proper distance, it burst upon our sight, in the midst of rolling masses of thick black clouds, partially obscured by that kind of haze, whose indistinctness is one great cause of sublimity; whilst a few strong catches of stormy light, thrown upon the desert in the back ground, served to give some idea of the immense extent and dreary solitude of the wastes, in which this venerable ruin stands."—(p. 36.)

The *Birs* of Nemrod is an oblong mound, its circumference seven

hundred and sixty-two yards, and it rises on the western side to the elevation of one hundred and ninety-eight feet. On the summit is a solid pile, thirty-seven feet high, of fine burnt bricks, exhibiting inscriptions. Other immense fragments of brick work are found also in this mound, which is itself a ruin, standing within a quadrangular inclosure. Near the Birs is another mound, and vestiges of ruins may be traced to a considerable extent.

In the vicinity of Hellah are several remains, which bear some relation to the ruins of Babylon. — (p. 39.) A tomb attributed to the prophet Job—the large canal of Jazeria—two large masses called *El mokhtat* and *El elouar*—and others near the village of Jerbo. “The governor of Hellah,” says Mr. R., “informed me of a mound as large as the Mujelibè, situated thirty-five hours to the south-west of Hellah; and that a few years ago a cap or diadem of pure gold, and some other articles of the same metal, were found there, which the Khezail Arabs refused to give up to the Pasha.”—(p. 39.) There are other mounds of considerable antiquity in various directions; and, six or six miles east of Hellah, a ruin which resembles on a smaller scale the Birs Nemroud; it is called *al Hheimar*.—(p. 40.) A mass, which the Arabs denominate *aker kuf*, and ascribe, like most of the remains in this country, to Nimrod, appears also of Babylonian origin. It stands ten miles N. W. of Baghdad, and rises to the height of one hundred and twenty-six feet.—(p. 41.)

Having offered some cursory remarks on the accounts left us by the ancients, our author declares his opinion, that, whatever may have been the size of Babylon, “its population bore no proportion to it; and that it would convey to a modern the idea of an inclosed district rather than that of a regular city.”—(p. 43.) The tower, (temple, pyramid, or sepulchre,) of Belus, corresponds, he thinks, in measurement “as nearly as possible, considering our ignorance of the exact proportion of the stadium,” with the ruin called Mujelibè.—(p. 49.) “The only building,” adds he, “which can dispute the palm with the Mujelibè, is the Birs Nemroud; previous to visiting which, I had not the slightest idea of the possibility of its being the tower of Belus: indeed its situation was a strong argument against such a supposition: but the moment I had examined it, I could not help exclaiming, ‘Had this been on the other side of the river, and nearer the great mass of ruins, no one could doubt of its being the remains of the tower.’”—(p. 52.) After an examination of the arguments against and for this opinion, Mr. R. leaves to learned men the decision of this point. He believes that the number of buildings in Babylon bore no proportion to the great space inclosed by the wall; that the houses were small, and mostly consisted of merely a ground floor, or *basse cour*; that the public edifices were more vast than beautiful, and that the tower of Belus was astonishing only from its size. “All the sculptures which are found among the ruins, though some of them are executed with the greatest apparent care, speak a barbarous people.”—(p. 58.) And it would appear that the Babylonians were acquainted with the arch, notwithstanding M. Dulaud’s assertion to the contrary. The ruins of

Babylon furnish bricks of two sorts: some burnt in a kiln, others simply dried in the sun; and the cement used appears to be bitumen, mortar and clay, or mud. "At the Majelibè, layers of reeds are found on the top of every layer of mud-cement, between it and the layer of brick."—(p. 65.)

Thus have we epitomized, however inadequately, this interesting memoir, which was originally published at Vienna, in the "*Mémoires de l'Orient*;" a work conducted by the learned orientalist, Mr. Hammer. "In it I have given," says Mr. Rich, "a faithful account of my observations at Babylon, and offer it merely as a prelude to further researches, which repeated visits to the same spot may enable me to make."—(p. 66.)

The present volume does not extend beyond sixty-seven octavo pages; and serves rather to excite than to satisfy curiosity. Besides the plan above mentioned, it is illustrated with two plates containing sketches of the Birs Nemroud, the Kasr, the Majulibè, and the embankment on the river Euphrates; which, though very small, seem to be accurate, and as no other authentic delineations of the Babylonian remains have ever been engraved, (at least to our knowledge,) these must be considered as valuable, until larger, handsomer, or better, shall have appeared.

After the perusal of this little memoir, we look forward with impatience for more ample information. Such may reasonably be expected from the result of Mr. Rich's future researches among the ruins, or from Captain Lockett's work with the views and plans announced two years ago in the *Classical Journal*, and at present, as we believe, nearly ready for publication. Meanwhile we would direct the notice of our readers to many passages scattered through the pages of Mr. Rich's memoir, especially the critical and etymological remarks of this ingenious writer on the Hebrew word *בֵּרְסָא* (to which we before alluded,) signifying, as differently translated, "satyrs, hairy-ones, devils, evil spirits, &c." (p. 30.) on *בֵּרְסָא*, or, Chaldeicè, *בֵּרְסָא*, perhaps

the modern *Bourra* *بوررا* and "probably," says Mr. R. "the Borsippa of Strabo and Barsita of Ptolemy."—(p. 39.) On the expression of Herodotus *στadium καὶ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ εὖρος*.—(p. 43.) On Genesis xi. 4. *בֵּרְסָא בְּרִשְׁתָּא*. Also on Genesis xi. 5. relative to the bricks and mortar or cement used in the construction of Babel. (p. 60) Concerning all these passages we shall venture to offer our own opinions in another place, and close this article by suggesting, on the authority

of a friend (who has travelled in the east) that *Birs* *برس* applied to the mound or tower of Nimrod, and apparently not Arabic, (as Mr. R. observes p. 34.) may possibly be a corruption from some other word, like *Makallibè*, vulgarly pronounced *Majelibè* (p. 28.) where we find both letters and accents altered: thus our friend thinks, it not improbable that the *BRS* which form the word *Birs* *برس* are nothing more than the *BRJ* of *برج* *Burj* or *Burge*, signifying "a tower," &c. and comprising the radicals of *برج*, according to the change usually made by Arabs, who, not having in their alphabet either *p* or *g*,

(like ours in gold, or the Greek *gemma*,) substitute for these letters their ب B, and ج C. Castell is inclined to derive the Arabic *Burj* برج from *πύργος*,¹ and we shall here remark, as a coincidence favorable to the conjecture above-mentioned, that Herodotus, in his first book, applies *πύργος* to the tower of Belus, and that from Mr. Rich's description (p. 51, 52, &c.) there are strong reasons for supposing that ornament of ancient Babylon to be the very ruin now denominated the *Birs* of Nimrod.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

HEBREW DESCENT OF THE ABYSSINIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

IN reading the xxxvth chapter of Jeremiah, and meeting with the name Habaziniah as the chief of the house of the Rechabites, and reflecting on the commands given by Jonadab their father to his sons (which they had faithfully observed), and comparing them with the name, language, and customs of the Abyssinians, as mentioned by Ludolf, Bruce, and others; and more particularly from observing the evident analogy between the name of this son of Jonadab, and that of the country of Abyssinia; I was strongly impressed with the idea, that the Abyssinians might be originally of this family, and that the house of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, who was never to want a man to stand before the Lord, might probably be found in Abyssinia at this day. I now trouble you with a few thoughts on this subject, and shall feel obliged by the opinion of any of your learned correspondents, and further information concerning it.

In 1 Chr. x. 55. we are informed that Hamath was the father of the Kenites, and of the house of Rechab; and these Kenites are here reckoned among the families of Judah: and in 2 Kings, x. 15. Jonadab the son of Rechab is mentioned; being in the Hebrew in this place, יהונדב *Jehonadab*, though it is sometimes found in Jeremiah with and without the י, and the *Jehonadab* is, in this xth chapter, found living in the days of Jehu, King of Israel.

In the xxxvth ch. of Jeremiah, or in the days of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, King of Judah, and of Jeremiah the Prophet, we read of

¹ *رج* &c. fo. à Gr. *πύργος*, *burgus*, *arcis-turris*, *propugnaculum*, &c. Lexicon, Heptaglott. in voce. p. 427.

house as then existing; and mention is made of the heads of three generations from him, namely of Jaazaniah, the son of Jeremiah, the son of Habaziniab; and of the sons of the third, viz. of Jaaziniab, making the fourth generation, ver. 1, 2; and of these three chiefs of the house of their fathers, Habaziniab seems to be the first in descent from Jonadab, and to be the person to whom the commandments were given. He was therefore the head of the house of Jonadab, and having obeyed the commands of his father, he transmitted them to his posterity to be kept in like manner: and as these commands (which were accompanied with a proposed advantage from the observance of them) were first given by Jonadab to his son Habaziniab, the latter became the beginning or head of all following generations, who should continue to obey their father Jonadab. Is it not probable that his name might be retained by his posterity as the patronymic name of the house of Rechab? Can they be found, at this day, under this name, in any nation, tribe, or people? Is not the country of Abyssinia named from this house? May I be permitted to state a few circumstances, which may probably assist in this inquiry; and first, concerning the name of this people and country?

Jobus Ludolfus, in his Hist. Æthiopica, lib. i. ch. i. "De variis Habessinorum nominibus, et gentis origine," inquires fully into this matter. He says they are generally called Habessini, or Abissini, or Abasseni; from the Arabian word *Habesh*; which signifies a colluvies or mixture of nations, or a number of men of different tribes or nations; and he thinks (note h.) that the Habessini may therefore be called *convenæ*: both signifying, according to Bruce, a number of distinct people meeting accidentally in one place, 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 323. Ludolf further informs us, that they long despised this appellation, as being opprobrious to them; and that they did not even acknowledge it in their books in his time, choosing rather that their kingdom should be called the kingdom of Æthiopia, and themselves Æthiopians; a word received from the Greeks, but too general, and common to all men of an adult color, and formerly even in Asia: that, if you ask for a particular name, they call their kingdom *Geez*, also the region *Ag-azi*, or the land of *Ag-azjan*, that is, of free men, *liberorum*; which he thus explains, "a libertate, sive a transitu, et profec-tione, quia verbum radicale *Geeza* utramque significationem admittit:" and he thinks, that probably from passing in the most ancient times from Arabia into Africa, to seek other settlements, they took this name as a sign of liberty; as the Germans having passed the Rhine took that of Franks: and he thinks that the

i. Quam appellationem tanquam sibi probrosam diu spreverunt, nec adhuc in libris suis agnoscunt.

Abyssinians dwelt formerly in Arabia, and were reckoned with the Sabæans, or Homerites, &c. His words are; "Indigenæ enim non sunt; sed venerunt ex ea Arabiæ parte, quæ Felix vocatur, et mari rubro adjacet; unde facile in Africam transfretare potuerunt. Abassenos enim in Arabia olim habitasse, atque Sabæis, sive (quod idem est) Homeritis accensitos fuisse, et veteres geographi testantur, et multa alia convincunt argumenta. Nam lingua illorum vetus, quam Æthiopicam vocamus, Arabicæ maxime affinis est: mores nonnullos, veluti circumcisionem, cum Arabibus communes habent: ingenium et forma corporis, atque vultus, ad Arabes magis quam ad Æthiopas Africanos accedit; quin et Severus Imperator inter gentes Arabiæ devictas summis suis etiam Abassenos (note *o*, 'Αβασσηνῶν, Scalig.) inscribi curavit." And he concludes this first chapter thus; "Romæ ~~non~~ primum libri Æthiopici typis ederetur, lingua eorum Chaldaica, illi vero erronee modo Chaldaei, modo Indi dicti fuerunt. Nos Habessinîæ vel Abassiæ nomen, jam universo orbi notum, inter ~~etiam~~ et Æthiopiæ retinebimus," &c.

In his Commentary, lib. i. c. i. No. 14. Ludolf enlarges upon the etymology of the names Habessini and Habesh, thus; "*Habessini*: nomen hoc in toto oriente, et nunc quoque in Europa Æthiopes nostri obtinent; variaute parumper pronuntiatione. Alii enim *Abasseni*, *Abassini*, vel *Abissini*, *Abessini*, vel *Ebessini*," (justly observing) "multi male *Abyssini* scribunt, quia hæc ~~vet~~ cum Abyssio nihil habet commune. Nos Abessinorum appellationem prætulimus, pronuntiationem Orientalium imprimis Arabum secuti." "Etenim in historia nostra docuimus, originem hujus appellationis Arabicam esse, radicis *Habeschâ*, vel *Habasha*," &c. "et hinc *Habesch* vel *Habeschi*, Habessinus," &c. &c. vide. And in No. 15. he thinks that it well agrees with the history of the transmigration of the Abyssinians from Arabia Felix into Africa; "Quippe migrationes gentium plerumque sunt cum confluxu omnis generis egenorum hominum," &c. adding, "Id Habessinîis contigisse credibile est, hominum multitudinæ patriam gravante; Sabæi enim, ex quibus originem trahunt, numerosissimi erant:" and he thinks it probable, that, though the name might be adopted at the time of the emigration, it might also be given to those who remained, "Nisi fortassis gentes e variis tribubus mixtæ hoc nomen antea in Arabia Felice gesserint, ad quorum exemplum novis colonis nomen istud impositum fuit; id enim apud veteres in Arabia reperitur;" showing, by a quotation from Stephanus, that a nation of this name formerly lived in Arabia; "*Stephanus de urbibus*: 'Αβασσηνοὶ ἄνθρωποι Ἀραβίας, *Abaseni* populus Arabiæ: addit ex *Uranio* *πρὸς τοὺς Σαβαίους Χαδραμώται καὶ Ἀβασσηνοὶ*, post *Sabæos Chadramotitæ et Abaseni*, καὶ πάλιν, ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἀβασσηνῶν, *Regio Abassenorum*." Here I may remark that the Greek name 'Αβασσηνοὶ would be as near to the rendering of the Hebrew word,

חבצנימ *Hhabatsinjim*, or short *Habassinim*, meaning the children or descendants of **חבצני**, as might be expected according to the Greek manner of rendering Hebrew proper names; as in the Septuagint, &c.

Ludolf, being about to speak of the conversion of the Abyssinians, by Frumentius, their first Bishop, lib. iii. c. 2. and having shown the improbability of its having happened before, observes; "Id demum certum est, quod et Habessinorum, et Græcorum Latinorumque scriptores, cum primis Rufinus et qui eum sequuntur, consensu tradunt, tempore S. Athanasii, Patriarchæ Alexandrini, sub Constantino Magno, circa annum Christi 330, (ut quidem Tellezius computat) vel non ita multo post, conversionem Æthiopiz hoc pacto contigisse;" &c. &c. proceeding to show the manner in which it was produced. See Scaliger de Emend. Temp. p. 481, where he seems erroneously to conclude that the Abyssinian nation had not passed from Arabia into Æthiopia in the beginning of the 6th century; which error seems fully pointed out by Ludolf, in his Com. lib. i. c. 1. and clearly refuted by the quotation just given.

Joseph Scaliger (ib. p. 680), speaking of the Abyssinians, observes: "Isti igitur Æthiopes, de quibus sermo est, Arabice dicuntur *Elhabaschi*. Unde vulgo Habassi, et Habasseni vocantur. Quod est argumentum eos non esse *Αἰθίοπας* *αἰθρόχθονας*, sed ex Arabia illuc traductos. Nam *Ἀβασηνολ* collocantur in Arabia turris a vetere scriptore Uranio apud Stephanum. In Severi autem Imperatoris numismate sculptum est *Ἀβασηνών*. Atqui Severus Imperator dictus est Arabicus, non autem Æthiopicus. Quare sine dubio ex Arabia oriundi sunt, et prius *Ουνγίται* dicebantur, quamdiu in Arabia fuerunt. Postea Axumitæ, a regia, sive metropoli urbe. Non igitur mirum, si qui apud Plinium et Ptolemaum vocantur *Ουνγίται* in Arabia Felici, ii Procopio Axumitæ cognominantur. Axuma enim sunt in Æthiopiâ, non in Arabia Felici. Huc accedit lingua, qua sacros libros scriptos habent, quæ vera Æthiopica tantum discrepat, quantum Italica et Illyrica; Germanica et Hungarica. Hæc autem lingua, qua in sacris utuntur, elegantissima est si modo cultura adhibeatur. Vocatur autem *ἰν*, id est libertas, quod nimirum ea sola uterentur Arabes illi victores, qui Æthiopiam insiderunt. Hoc scio, non concedent Æthiopes ipsi, qui regum suorum seriem hactenus a diluvio usque in Chronicis suis ordine descriptam habent. Sed quia illa Chronologia nobis tenebrarum plena visa est, non sine dilectu illi fidem adhibere censemus. Nobis constat hanc linguam adventitiam esse. Testes enim ipsos Æthiopes advoco, qui eam Chaldaicam vocant. Tametsi enim propius abest ab Hebræa, quam a Chaldaica: tamen hoc argumento ipsimet fidem faciunt non esse ibi

matam, ubi nunc colitur, et ex solis libris a solis sacerdotibus dicitur."

Mr. Bruce says, "The people assert themselves at this day to be *agaazi*, that is, a race of shepherds inhabiting the mountains of the Habab;" that they were Sabæans; that these shepherds were in most respects different from the negro woolly-headed *Cushite*, "as they had long hair, European features, very dusky and dark complexions, but nothing like the blackmoor or negro; that they lived in plains, had moveable huts or habitations, while attending their numerous cattle, and wandered from the necessities and particular circumstances of their country: that they were generally called shepherds, are still existing living by the same occupation, never had another and therefore cannot be mistaken: that "the mountains which the *Agaazi* inhabit are called Habab, from which it comes that they themselves have got that name:" that the noblest and most warlike of all the shepherds were those that inhabited the mountains of the Habab, and that they still dwelt there: that Habab, in their language and in the Arabic, signifies a serpent; and his editor, in a note, observes, that, according to the book of Axum, Arwe is the first king of Axum, and reigned 400 years; that before their conversion to Christianity, the *Æthiopian* historians say that their nation worshipped Arwe, the serpent, and part were Jews, people of the law, &c. *Bruce's Travels*, vol. ii.

Bruce also reports that "in Abyssinia, besides the Cushites and the shepherds, there are various nations which agree with this description, who have each a particular name, and who are all known by that of Habesh, in Latin, *Convenæ*, signifying," as above mentioned, "a number of distinct people meeting accidentally in one place;" and thinks that the word has been misunderstood and misapplied by Scaliger, Ludolf, and others. He speaks of Abyssinia having been inhabited, according to the *Chronicle of Axum*, about 1808 years before Christ, &c.; that about the 1400th year before Christ, it was taken possession of by a variety of people speaking different languages, who sat down in a friendly manner beside the *Agaazi*, or shepherds, then possessing the high country of Tigré, which finished the peopling of Abyssinia, and that tradition declared they came from Palestine; from which he conjectures that these new settlers were the nations of Canaan, who had fled from before Joshua; which his editor thinks is neither probable nor authentic. *Ib.* vol. ii. p. 322, 323, 324.

Respecting the conversion of the Abyssinians to Christianity, Bruce (*ib.* p. 431.) thinks it happened about the time mentioned by Ludolf, and by means of Frumentius. He observes, "We know certainly, that the first Bishop, ordained for the conversion of Abyssinia, was sent from Alexandria by St. Athanasius, who was

himself ordained to that see about the year 326. Therefore any account prior to this ordination and conversion must be false; and this conversion and ordination must therefore have happened about the year 330, or possibly some few years later," &c.; referring to *Ludolf*, vol. ii. lib. iii. cap. 2. viz. *Hist. Æthiop.*

From considering Bruce's account of the above Chronicle, and of *Arwe*, and comparing it with the Editor's note, may we not conjecture, that, by the worshipping of the Serpent (meaning the Old Serpent), for the period of four hundred years, and that he was their first king, being called *Arwe*, (which, by a very natural etymology from the Hebrew, might signify *the King*, *הַמֶּלֶךְ*, *ha-roghe*, or *roe*, or *the shepherd*), a parabolic history of the nation, from the time of its emigration from Arabia to its conversion to Christianity, is given? Or, that the nation, emigrating about seventy years before the birth of our Lord, did, as it were, continue in certain errors, under the dominion of the Old Serpent, until A. D. 330, and were then converted to Christianity, making a period of four hundred years? And as, in order to avoid the opprobrious name, they called themselves by the name of the original inhabitants of Æthiopia, or Æthiopians; may not their claims to a more remote antiquity of residence, as found in the same Chronicle, be thus accounted for? This application of *Arwe* to the Old Serpent seems fully warranted by the following extract from *Ludolf*; in which the Poet, celebrating the praises of nine pious monks, who zealously endeavoured to promote the knowledge of that Gospel which Frumentius had introduced, most evidently refers to the kingdom of Satan, as is explained by *Ludolf*;

"*Salutem Sanctis! qui concorditer vixerunt concordiam:
Ut per preces destruerent regnum Arwe (Serpentis).*

Per vocem Arwe, quæ Serpentem significat, vel regnum Satanae in genere intelligit, quod propagatione Christianismi fuit destructum; vel Ethnicismum Æthiopicum in specie." *Lud. Hist. lib. ii. c. 3.*

I shall now make a few cursory remarks on the opinions of Scaliger, *Ludolf*, and Bruce, as hints for further inquiry. I have above shown that Scaliger considers the name of this people, *Habaschi*, vulgo *Abassi*, et *Abasseni*, as derived from the Arabic, and that they undoubtedly came from Arabia, and were called, in Arabia, *Oungirai*; and afterwards (when in Africa) *Axumitz*: and that he thinks their language, in which their sacred books are written, which is called *Ḳṣṣ*, is a dialect of the true Æthiopic, but the most elegant; and that it is an adventitious language, as asserted by themselves who call it Chaldee, although it is nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldee; and that *Ludolf* also desires

the name *Habessini*, &c. from the same Arabian source, from the word *Habesh*, &c.; but whether it might be adopted at the time of the emigration, as expressive of the conflux of different kinds of people which generally happens on these occasions, and might be believed to happen to the Abyssinians, and was then applied to those about to emigrate and to those who were left behind; or whether there might have before existed nations in Arabia Felix consisting of various tribes called by this name, which after their example was given to the new colonists, he leaves undetermined. Therefore this etymology and explanation of Ludolf are unsatisfactory, and seem to be wholly conjectural. But it appears by his quotation from Stephanus, which includes that of Uranius, that the Abyssinian people did certainly exist in Arabia at a very early period, under the name of Ἀβυσσηνοί, and that the region which they there inhabited was called ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἀβυσσηνῶν, the region of the Abyssinians. And although they, afterwards, had the general name of Οὐγγῖται, because they then dwelt, and were numbered, among that people, it is manifest from the coin of Severus, that they had also the distinct name of Ἀβυσσηνοί, or Abyssinians.

Had the name *Habeschi*, or *Habesh*, been their original name, they would most probably have been called by the Greeks Ἀβαροί, instead of Ἀβυσσηνοί. Is it not more probable that the Arabic name *Habeschi* was a kind of nick-name given to them by the Arabians, perhaps from considering them as a different people, and probably made up of different tribes, particularly as the Abyssinians considered it as opprobrious? This might very naturally be the case; as, supposing them to be the sons of Habatsiniah, the son of Jonadab, they were a different people, whose customs might in various respects differ from those of the Arabians, who might therefore give them the name of *Habesh*, by way of contempt; which might readily occur to them from the similarity of their patronymic name. And this similarity, and the contemptuous meaning being generally understood, might even determine the Abyssinians to lay aside their original name, and adopt that of the country where they dwelt. If so, it is the more probable that this people, who had probably sojourned some considerable time in Arabia, were really a nation different from the Arabian.

Ludolf further informs us, as already noticed, that they call their kingdom *Geez*, also the region *Ag-azi*, or land *Ag-azjan*; which he renders of freemen, *liberorum*, and considers it as having been adopted by them as a sign of liberty at some time of their passage from Arabia into Africa.

Mr. Bruce, who shows that they are a very different people from the *Æthiopians*, says that they call themselves *Agazi*, or a race of shepherds, as he interprets it, who inhabit the mountains of *Habab*; that, in Abyssinia there are various other nations, who

with them are generally known by the name of Habesh, or *convenæ*, which he explains as above.

But these and all the other etymologies proceed from the consideration of the Abyssinians being Arabians, and their language the Arabic. But from the idea of their being the sons of Habazimiah of the house of Rechab, and their language the Hebrew, and that their original name was a patronymic name from their father Habazimiah, we are naturally led to the Hebrew in tracing the etymology of their name, and that of their language and country. Considering the subject in this light, I proceed with my remarks, and shall begin with the account given by the Prophet Jeremiah of this family or nation.

In the 35th chapter of Jeremiah it is reported, that in the days of Jehoiaquim, son of Josiah, King of Judah, Jeremiah was commissioned to go to the house of the Rechabites, and to bring them into a chamber of the house of the Lord, and to give them wine to drink. The Prophet having offered them pots full of wine, they answered, "We will drink no wine, for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us saying, 'Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye, nor your sons for ever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents, that ye may live many days in the land, where ye be strangers.' Thus have we obeyed the voice of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, in all that he hath charged us, to drink no wine all our days, we, our wives, our sons, nor our daughters; nor to build houses for us to dwell in; neither have we field, nor vineyard, nor seed; but we have dwelt in tents, and have obeyed and done according to all that Jonadab our father commanded us. But it came to pass when Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, came up into the land, that we said, 'Come, let us go to Jerusalem for fear of the army of the Chaldeans, and for fear of the army of the Syrians:' so we dwell at Jerusalem."

How good and how pleasant is this account of filial veneration, affection, and obedience! The children of Jonadab, even to the fourth generation, are found walking in the commandments of their father.

God, wishing to instruct the Jews, having contrasted the obedience of the sons of Jonadab with their disobedience, is pleased to bestow a gracious promise upon the house of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, as the reward of their obedience; while punishment is denounced against Judah and Jerusalem, for their contempt of the divine commands. The promise runs thus, "Because ye have obeyed the commandment of Jonadab your father, and kept all his precepts, and done according to all that he hath commanded you; therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Jonadab,

the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever :’ 18th and 19th verses.

Are we not warranted, in faith of this promise, to look for the family of Jonadab at this day ? Do they not now live in Abyssinia ? Is not this worthy of inquiry ?

In proceeding with the few hints I now offer, I shall first notice the text of Jeremiah, and then endeavour to show, that the words, according to the same easy and natural etymology before-mentioned, are more referable to a Hebrew, than to an Arabic origin ; and lastly, attempt to point out, that above an eighth part of a vocabulary of Abyssinian words, given by Bruce, are chiefly Hebrew words : thus paving the way for further inquiry.

Jer. xxxv. 3. “Then I took Jaazaniah, the son of Jeremiah, the son of Habaziniab, and his brethren, and all his sons, and the whole house of the Rechabites ;”—

Here are four generations from Jonadab, who was alive, and probably a young man, in the reign of Jehu, a period of about two hundred and seventy eight years. So that the generations of Jonadab and his sons, being to the fifth generation inclusive, amounted to above two hundred and seventy years ; making, according to this number, 54 years to each generation ; which, though more than usually reckoned to a generation, would only confirm the prophetic intimation given by the father, when he commanded his sons to abstain from wine.

The part of this verse which requires our particular observation, is the word Habaziniab, the father of all the succeeding children of Jonadab. In Hebrew it is חֲבַצְיָיָה, *Hhabatzsinjah*, according to the Masoretic punctuation ; or, without the points, *Hhabatsiniab* : and how very near is this to Abyssinia, or rather to Abassiniab. It is indeed formed by simply leaving out the aspiration of the first Hebrew letter, and reserving the vowel with which it is here naturally connected, and changing the *t* of *tsadi*, the double Hebrew letter, for *s*, and thus instead of *ts*, giving *ss* ; a change which is very common in rendering Hebrew proper names, as the reader will soon perceive. But before I proceed further, I beg leave to call the reader’s attention to the very proper remark of Ludolf, in lib. i. ch. i. No. xiv. of his Commentary already quoted ; where he points out the impropriety of the term *Abyssini*, as having nothing in common with that of *Abyss*. If, therefore, the improper pronunciation of *Abyssinians* was omitted, and that of *Abassinians* substituted in its place, it might more agree with the etymology given by Ludolf ; and would fully agree with that from the Hebrew, according to the usual rendering of proper names.

Various readings of this name in its passage through different translations :—Heb. חֲבַצְיָיָה, *Hhabatzsiniah* :—Sept. Ἀβασινωί,

Chabasinus :—Vulg. *Habsania* :—et ita Castellio, Mont. et Pag. *Chabassiniah* :—Jun. et Tremel. *Chabatzinja* :—Schmid. *Chabazinja* :—Joan. Cleric. *Chabattzinja* :—Eng. *Habaziniah*.

Now you will perceive that, according to the different powers assigned to the double Hebrew letters of the original word, and to the usual mode of rendering proper names, all these various readings may be easily accounted for and explained : and the change in producing the proper name of the Abyssinians, which, according to our derivation from Habazinia, and making it as short and harmonious as possible, seems to be *Abassinians*, is easy and natural.

I shall now endeavour to show that there is so great a resemblance between the language of Abyssinia and the Hebrew, that, notwithstanding the great changes which might be expected to happen, and which have happened, in their manner of speech, from their intercourse with different tribes and nations, during the long period of above two thousand years, the reader will agree with me in opinion, that their language was originally the Hebrew ; and, from this and other circumstances he may finally conclude, that they themselves are the sons of Jonadab, and probably the chief part of the family of the house of Rechab.

A portion of the Lord's Prayer in the Ethiopic, or Abyssinian language, compared with that of the Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, chiefly from Fry's Pantographia ; with some remarks.

P. 82. Mr. Fry gives the Lord's Prayer, first in Ethiopic characters, *from Orat. Dom.* p. 14, and calls it the Ethiopic ; or Amharic, from Amhara the chief city of Abyssinia : 2dly, p. 83. a literal reading of the same, *from Wilk. Ess.* p. 435.

From this last, I now give the preface and first petition, as a specimen of the reading of the Abyssinian language ; and at the same time the readings of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac ; by which the reader may judge concerning the Abyssinian.

P. 148. This preface and petition are taken from the Hebrew edition of Munster ; and read thus, אָבִינוּ שְׁבַשְׁמַיִם יְקֹדֵשׁ שָׁמַיִם ; or, according to the concise manner of reading, thus, *Abinu shebashamajim jikkadesh shemeca*.

Heb. reading. Abinu shebashamajim : jikkadesh shemeca.

P. 83. *Eth. or Abyss.* Abuna xabashamajath. Ythkadash shimacha.

P. 282. *Syriac.* Abhoun dbhaschmajo. Nethkadash shmoch. *Orat. Dom.* p. 12.

P. 8. *Arabic.* Ya abanalladi phissamawati. Yatakaddasu smoca. *Wilk. Ess.* p. 435.

In considering these four various readings, it seems evident that the Ethiopic, or Abyssinian, is nearest to the Hebrew ; and that the Ethiopic preface is more like the Syriac than the Arabic, to which last it seems to have little resemblance. Is not this a convincing argument that they were not originally Arabians ?

In further proof of the similarity of the Abyssinian language to the Hebrew, I shall now give a short extract from Bruce, of a vocabulary of the five languages spoken in Abyssinia when he was there; omitting, in the different columns, those words which seem to have no affinity to the Hebrew; and adding the Hebrew.

English.	Amharic.	Falashan.	Gafut.	Agow.	Tihari.	Hebrew.	Latin.	English.
A star	kokeb	kokeb	כוכב	Kokub, stella, sidus, star.	
Fruit	fre	fra	frash	פרי	peri or phri, fructus, fruit.	
Honey	debsa	דבש	debush, mel, honey.	
Father	abat	yaba	abuya	אב	ab, pater, father.	
The head	ras	ראש	rosh or rash, caput, the head.	
Hair	tsegur	tschegur	שער	seghar, pilus, capillus, hair.	
A horse	feres	ferza	ferdesh	firsi	fras	פרש	pharash, eques, a horseman.	
Camel	gemele	gembila	gemli	gemla	gemla	גמל	gamal, camelus, camel.	
Eye	ain	ie	ein	עין	ghain, oculus, the eye.	
Mouth	af	אפה	aphaph, circuire, to go round.	
						פה	phe, os, mouth.	
						אף	aph, nasus, facies.	
Teeth	sena	שן	shen, dens, tooth.	
Ear	azin	אזן	ozen or azen, auris, ear.	
Heart	leb	lebeb	lebedje	לב	lebub, cor, and defect. לב leb, heart.	
To kill	mwata	המית	hemith, mori facere, interficere, to kill.	
Die	mota	מות	muth, mori, to die.	
Bless	baraka	barket	barkuwa	barku	ברך	burak, benedixit, to bless.	
						ברכה	berucah, benedictio, a blessing.	
						קרב	kareb, propinquus, near.	
Near	kerbe	kerhuwi	קרוב	karob, propinquum, prope, near.	
						ארך	arak, deferre in longum, to carry to a distance.	
Far	arak	ארך	orek or arek, longitudo.	
A son	ledj	ילד	yeled, puer, natus, a son.	
A woman	set	anset	אנשה	anasha or ansha, mulier, a woman.	
A bird	af	yafe	עוף	ghuf, volare, to fly.	
To hide	zafna	zafni	צפן	tsaphan, abscondere, to hide.	

I may here remark, that, in the vocabulary from which the above is taken, about one hundred and eighty two words are given; and that, in the above extract, there are about twenty two, being more than an eighth part of the whole, which seem evidently to be derived from the Hebrew; yea, frequently, to be Hebrew itself. If, then, the "similarity of language is the best proof of the common origin of nations, and such a proof as will illustrate, above any other monument, the history of mankind, even admitting that no other relic existed," Bruce: I beg leave to offer the above as a strong presumptive proof of the Hebrew descent of the Abyssinians.

Another circumstance may be mentioned, which may assist in this inquiry; it is, that Bochart, in Hieroz. vol. i. lib. ii. c. 48, in speaking of the sons of Nebaioth, the son of Ishmael, the Nabatæi, an Arabian nation, observes, that Diodorus speaks of them as having customs like unto those of the Rechabites. "*Quod de Nabatæis Diodorus disertè scribit libro decimo nono, p. 722. Νομος, &c. 'Lex ipsis est, ut neque fructus serant, neque fructiferam ullam arborem inserant, neque vino utantur, neque domos ædificent.' Quæ sunt ipsissima Rechabitarum instituta.*" Jer. xxxv. 6. 7. But were they not rather some of the descendants of Jonadab, then sojourning among the children of Nebaioth, the son of Ishmael?

KATON.

ON THE GREEK AND LATIN ACCENTS.

No. III.

THE Hebrew language, like the Greek, was written originally as if the text were but one word, without distinction of words or sentences. Juxta sententiam Cabbalistarum *tota lex ut instar unius versiculi*, quin et secundum quosdam *unius vocis* (sive vocabuli). Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum. p. 19. By what means, besides the introduction of the five final letters above mentioned, the Jews contrived to divide words in context one from another, I do not know; but it is generally known, that the division of sentences in Hebrew is effected by some of the Hebrew Accents, such as, Silluk, Athnac, Segol, and Zakeph Katon. These answer the purposes of our full stop, colon, semi-colon, and comma. The Hebrews are supposed to have introduced points and accents about the fifth century, and there can be little doubt that they have been copied from the Greek Model. But those who adopt the invention of others, are very apt to flatter themselves, that they can improve on it. Accordingly the

Masoretic school of Tiberias have so overloaded the Hebrew letters with adscititious marks, as to make them an annoyance rather than an assistance to the reader. The text is almost obscured by the quantity of clothing given to it. *Pars minima est ipsa Puella sui.* The greatest enemies however to Punctuation admit the utility of those points, whose office it is to distinguish periods, and their members. It is enough for my purpose to state, that there exists this striking analogy between the Greek and Hebrew accents, that they are both subservient not to pronunciation merely, but to distinction, the Hebrew to the distinction of *sentences*, the Greek to the distinction of *words*.

The consideration of the preceding doctrine relative to the Initial Spirits, and the Final Acute may suffice to let in a full light upon matters, which hitherto have been enveloped in an impenetrable cloud. It would be both tedious and invidious to expose the strained conceits, and unsatisfactory dreams rather than arguments and proofs of modern Grammarians as to the use of the lene spirit, and the grave on Oxytons. I flatter myself, that the principles, which I have unfolded, are capable of affording a clear and general insight into these two peculiarities of Greek Orthography, and that it may now be said confidently,

Repentè

Scindit se nubes, et in æthera purgat apertum.

To remove however all doubt upon the subject, as far as I am able, I will enter into a more detailed examination of the system and pursue the application of it to some other particulars. It may be considered as a part of this system and as a confirmation of the truth of it, that the acute resumes its ordinary character, whenever Oxytons are followed by an Enclitic. An Oxyton so circumstanced is not a *final* quality, but becomes incorporated with the Enclitic, and therefore in such case the position of a final acute would be wrong, and a contradiction and misdirection.

An Oxyton likewise has no occasion for a final acute, and does not positively *require* it, whenever it concludes a sentence, and I may add, on the strong ground of Analogy, whenever it terminates a colon, or a comma, or is so placed in the context as to have its final syllable demonstrated by a parenthesis, or any other equivalent distinction. Thus if I say, "that the noun (ἄνρ) is an oxyton," as the termination of the word is in this case sufficiently designated by the parenthesis, it were actum agere, and a work of supererogation, to designate also its termination by the *final acute*. But Herman is mistaken, when he says that the oxyton Ἀχιλλεύς in the following expression ought to have an acute accent, τὸ Ἀχιλλεύς ὄνομα (de emendanda etc. p. 67); for

here as there is no stop, nor any thing in the nature of a stop, after the oxyton, Ἀχιλλεύς, to denote the final syllable, the final acute according to my Canon of Orthography is *required*. I will help Herman to a better, and the only, way of justifying the omission of the final acute in the foregoing expression, which is, that, as the oxyton is followed by a word having an *initial* spirit ὄνομα, the final syllable of the oxyton may be thought to be *indirectly* indicated by this initial, and under such circumstances the omission of the final acute is certainly consistent with reason, if not with usage. For a similar reason perhaps Lascaris gives παντὶ τ' ἀνθρώπων instead of παντί τ' ἀνθρώπων. Medea, v. 13. 21. ed. Pors.

Herman being entirely in the dark as to the true and simple cause of omitting the final acute on these occasions does not hesitate to supply from his own invention a reason for it, and gives us very gravely this amusing and highly metaphysical account of the matter. "*Quam pronunciandi rationem uti sponte sequitur vox, ita etiam ipsa rei Natura veram esse docet. Nam orationis perpetuitate sublatâ, quæ unicè in constructionis continuatione posita est, erigi etiam accentum, quem constructio conspicerat, necesse est.*" What is all this, but Nodum in scirpo querere?

Unfortunately for Herman's hypothesis these grave accents of oxytons in the middle of a sentence, or accents set asleep (*consopiti* accentus), as he terms them, are frequently found not to be in motion (*erigi*) at the end of a sentence, but to remain even there in a *dormant* and *quiescent* state, notwithstanding the physical necessity that they should do otherwise. The ignorant transcribers of manuscripts, having as little knowledge of this physical necessity, as of the difference between Dr. Foster's apex of tone, and that of time above mentioned, have paid no sort of attention to it; for in Montfaucon's Palæographia we find many oxytons still retaining the *final acute*, although at the end of a sentence. See Palæographia, p. 217 at the word *χλιασμὸν* twice, p. 212. at the word *πνευματικόν*, p. 271. at the word *ψυχὰς*, and p. 274. at the word *σοφίᾳ*. Thus too Lascaris has printed at the end of a sentence *αὐτόν* for *αὐτόν*. See Porson's Medea in Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 2. l. 3.

I mention this circumstance as no otherwise material than to show the fallacy of those, who, like Herman and most others, would make us believe that there is a real essential difference, of some subtle property, but what they do not well know, between the *very same* oxytons in the middle, and at the end of a sentence, and that it is in the latter situation alone, that oxytons are genuine, and have the full force of acutes. The authors of this doctrine might as well pretend, that there is a difference in power between

the common and the final sigma, and puzzle themselves and others in endless researches after the quality of the supposed distinction. Heyne is the only critic, as far as I know, who is heretical enough to deny this article of what may be called the catholic faith of grammarians, and he has declared simply and boldly, *Qui acutus est in prioribus syllabis, idem est quoque acutus in ultimâ, sive sive pingatur*. Homer. v. 5. p. 179.

The plain truth is, that though it would be a breach of a most useful law of orthography not to mark the concluding syllable of oxytons in the *middle* of a sentence with a final acute, it is no error, or at most an error on the safe side, to preserve the final acute even at the *end* of a sentence, and after a full stop, although the final syllable of the word in such a situation is sufficiently determined, independently of the accentual character, by punctuation alone. The retention therefore of the final acute in the preceding examples from Montfaucon and Lascaris may be considered as unnecessary, and superfluous, but is not faulty. In the same way, in our printed books, we not only put a full stop, where it is absolutely required, at the end of every sentence in close connexion and on the same line with a succeeding one, but, what is surprising, at the end of detached paragraphs, and of the book itself, and even after the declaratory finis, a mode of punctuation, that is innocent indeed, and may be allowed to custom, although not demanded by reason. In all these cases there is not a misdirection, but a double direction.

Whenever in short the end of a word is ascertainable by any other means than the final acute, the introduction of this character is unnecessary, and the oxytons may be marked with the common acute. Accordingly, oxytons are found so marked not only at the end of sentences, but at the end of verses, as in these lines of Theocritus :

ἔνθα μίᾳς πολλοὶ κατὰ κλίμακος ἀμφοτέρων ἔξ
τοίκων ἄνδρες ἔβαινον Ἰησονίης ἀπὸ νηός.

See Herman, De emendandâ etc. p. 66.

Of a piece with the preceding principle is the omission, frequent in many manuscripts, and even in many printed books, of the initial lene, at the beginning of books, chapters, sentences, and verses. Now the reason of this omission is evident, for, if the use of the lene is only to mark the beginning of words, it may be well spared, wherever their beginning is as strongly marked by their position—For instance to set an initial sign before the first line of the Odyssey,

Ἀνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, etc.

is a very unnecessary trouble. But to omit the *aspirate* at the beginning of a word is never justifiable, although sometimes done ; as the aspirate has a double office, and is always useful as the sign

of a letter, where it may not be wanted as an initial sign.—So the aspirate should be retained both as an initial sign, and as a letter, whenever rho or hu, or as it is commonly called, upsilon, occur at the beginning of words placed in context, that is in the middle of a sentence, not only to mark the beginning of the word, but also to distinguish the initial rho and hu from the medial and final ro and upsilon; for there is the same difference between rho and ro, and hu and upsilon, as there is between phi, and pi; except that in hu the aspirate is a prefix, and in rho and phi, an affix to the principal letter. But whenever rho and hu occur not in context, and are placed at the head of a verse or sentence, the initial aspirate is better omitted, as it is not wanted as an initial sign, and its force as a spirit is included in the letters themselves, demanding uniformly and invariably an aspirate at the beginning of words. It is as ridiculous to write

"Τῆριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε etc. and 'Ρίψε ποδὸς τεταγών, etc.

with an initial aspirate, as it would be to write,

'Θαρησῆσας μάλα εἰπὲ, etc.

with an aspirate to the theta. It is an abuse of the *initial* spirits, and a flat contradiction to their design, ever to place them in the *middle* of words. By what authority therefore, and to what advantage πυρρὸς and μυρρίνη are decorated with an initial lene, and an initial aspirate, in the middle, I leave to the learned to determine. It appears to me that the peculiar force of the double rho is as intelligible from the use of two rhos, as that of the double gamma is from the use of two gammas, and that no greater index, than what the letters themselves afford, is required to inform us, either that πυρρὸς flavus is to be pronounced as pyrrhus, or that ἄγγελος is to be pronounced as angelus, expressed in latin characters.

An attention to the preceding observations may account for the absence of the common acute and acute final and of the spirits also, in the curious manuscript of the psaltery, written by Sedulius Scottus. A specimen of it is given in Montfaucon's Palæographia p. 237. In this manuscript every word is distinguished by a dot or full stop at the end of it. The ordinary accentual marks and spirits not being therefore wanted for this office of distinguishing words in context, they are altogether omitted, and the seat of the accent is denoted uniformly by a simple dot over the accented syllable. As in this mode of accentual notation no difference is made between the circumflex and the acute, it is probable that in the age of Sedulius Scottus no difference in pronunciation existed, and that the peculiar power of the circumflex had become lost to the Greeks of his time, as it is to the modern Greeks. I believe, it may be generally asserted, that wherever words are

distinguished by dots, or other devices at the end of them, there the regular accents are never introduced. On the contrary, in the example above cited, p. 25, where accents are placed on *every* word, without regard to tone, and merely to mark the *termination*, there a dot or stop after each word is not necessary, and is not therefore to be found, except after a few words, as a mark of abbreviation. There cannot, I think, exist a more clear relation of cause and effect, than what is exhibited by these two modes of notation, both never occurring together, but the one always officiating as a substitute for the other, and the whole amounts to demonstration, that a primary object of both dots, and accents, has been to assist the reader in the right division of words in context, by enabling him to discern quickly and at a glance their beginning and ending.

It may be thought by some, that the modern mode of distinguishing one word from another, by a space between them, is much more convenient, and that the mode of arriving at the same end by the apparatus of Spirits and Accents is comparatively very complex and cumbersome. I certainly do not mean to weigh, for a moment, together the comparative advantages of the two methods, but if we wish to form a fair estimate of the merit of the Greek method, we must not measure it by the present standard of Orthography, but should transport ourselves to the age, when it was invented, and have regard to the state and circumstances of literature at that period.

In this kind of criticism, more than in any other, we shall do the greatest injustice to our Predecessors, and expose the hastiness of our own judgment, unless we constantly bear in mind the sage maxim of Ovid,

Indicis officium est, ut res, ita tempora rerum
Cernere.

I have stated before, that it was one merit of the accentual marks, that they served at the same time the double purpose of marking the Tone and the Division of words. But they had another and even superior merit in being as applicable to *old* manuscripts as to *new*. The introduction of any method, however excellent in all other respects, if it had superseded and rendered obsolete and in a manner useless all pre-existing manuscripts, would on this account alone have been imperfect and exceptionable. It was a peculiar advantage belonging to the apparatus of Accents and Spirits, that it disturbed nothing, which it found established, and was a sort of new machinery, that could be affixed to the old, without displacing or effacing a single particle of the original.

There can be little doubt that many old manuscripts were soon furnished with it, and were rendered by this means much more

legible and valuable. It may readily be conceived too, that to apply this machinery, as it ought to be applied, that is, to divide each word rightly by it, so as to produce the best and true sense, (the context of ancient writers presenting till this period nothing but a confused mass of letters) was a task of immense labor, and one also that required much sagacity, taste, knowledge, and judgment. No wonder therefore, that the greatest scholars of antiquity did not think it beneath them to exercise their talents in this species of criticism. In this pursuit, Aristarchus, the worthy pupil of the father of the invention, we are told, 'was indefatigable, and spent a long life of meritorious industry, (the fruits of which we to this day experience) in the correction of Homer, and no less than *right hundred* other authors.' Among the Latins Valerius Probus dedicated himself to the like studies. According to Suetonius, (De illustr. Gramm. b. 24.) *multa exemplaria contracta* (that is, as I apprehend, not abbreviated, but procured by purchase, or otherwise) *emendare, ac distinguere, et adnotare curavit, soli huic nec ulli præterea Grammaticis parti deditus.* At a later period the same practice continued, and Montfaucon suspects, that to many of the most ancient manuscripts in capitals the Accents, Spirits, and Stops have been added by a later hand. Palæogr. p. 196, and 217.

If this ingenious invention of Marks for the division of words had been founded on principles merely *arbitrary*, it would have taken nothing from its utility. It is however a further topic of recommendation, that it seems founded on the very nature of speech, as it is by Accent chiefly that one word in pronunciation is distinguishable from another. Orthography therefore in this instance is in strict unison with Pronunciation, and the criterion, adopted to distinguish words to the eye of the reader, is the very one, which existed, previously to the invention of any character, in the mouth of the speaker. On this subject the observations of our English Grammarian, Lindley Murray, appear to me very judicious, and as they are apposite to the present point I will cite them. "As words may be formed," he says, "of a different number of syllables, from one to eight or nine, it was necessary to have some peculiar mark to distinguish words from mere syllables; otherwise speech would be only a continued succession of syllables, without conveying ideas: for as words are the marks of ideas, any confusion in the marks must cause the same in the ideas, for which they stand. It was therefore necessary that the mind should at once perceive what number of syllables belongs to each word, in utterance. The English tongue has, for this purpose, adopted a mark of the easiest and simplest kind, which is

called Accent, and which effectually answers the end!"¹ Of the justice of these observations any one may be convinced who attends to the difference of pronunciation between the single word, *holydays*, and the two divided words, *holy days*, and between the country, *Newfoundland*, and the three divided words, *new found land*. The same distinction holds good in Latin and in Greek. Thus *crucifigo*, *ususcapio*, or *plebiscitum* with one Accent is one word, but divided into *cruci figo*, *usûs captio*, etc. they become two words, and each requires a separate Accent. In Greek too we find many compounds written indifferently sometimes with one Accent as one word, and sometimes resolved into their constituent parts, with a separate accent to each part, as *παραυτίκα*, or *παρ' αὐτίκα*, *ἐπιτοπολὺ*, or *ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ*, *σύνετος*, or *σὺν ὅσῳ*, *σύμπαντες*, or *σὺν πάντεσσι*, etc. The curious may see a large collection of such words in Duker's Preface to Thucydides. Some imagine that in the French Language there are no accents, but this is a mistake. The pronunciation of French is certainly more even, and less strongly accented, than our own, and this quality renders it peculiarly favorable to double meanings. The Parisians are therefore great punsters, and a great deal of their wit turns upon a sleight of pronunciation. Of this nature is the pun mentioned by Lord Blayney, and applied by the wits of Paris to Buonaparte, *Le char l'attend*, or *Le charlatan*. Narrative etc. Vol. 2. p. 101. In English too, as well as in Latin and Greek, there are many weak unemphatic words, chiefly monosyllables, more rarely dissyllables, that coalesce with others into one word, and receive together with their principal but one Accent. We have therefore in effect, though not in name, both Enclitics and Proclitics. What is meant by Proclitics, a word coined, I believe, by Herman, and not unhappily, will best be explained by Herman himself. *Præter Encliticas aliud genus dictionum extat accentum suum deponentium, quas Procliticas nominare placet, quia accentum non in præcedente, sed in sequente vocabulo deponunt.* De emendandâ etc. p. 96. This analogy of many English words to Enclitics has been well observed by Dr. Valpy, who has given in his Greek Grammar the following familiar example of it: "When we say, *give me that book*, we pronounce *me* as part of the word *give*."² There is no doubt, but that *give me* is in this instance as much one word to the ear,

¹ Vol. 1. P. 329.

² P. 166. Third ed. I think I may say without partiality, that this Grammar contains more useful information for its size, than any other Grammar extant. It gives a compendious view of the fruits of modern research together with much original and ingenious matter. At the same time, and with all due deference to the great authorities both at home and abroad from whom I differ, I can never give my entire approbation to this, or to

as *prilhee*, or *methinks*, although the latter are not only pronounced, but always written as one word. In the following phrase, *on-which-account*, we use always three words in writing, but pronounce them, I think, frequently as one word, like *quamobrem* in Latin, giving an accent to the middle word *which*, while both the first and last words lose their Accent, the one as a Proclitic, the other as an Enclitic. The tendency to multiply Enclitics, and to make small words coalesce into one in pronunciation by the subtraction of Accent, is very observable among common people, and children. These, if desired to repeat the Lord's Prayer, generally begin in this manner: "Our Father, *which-art* in Heaven," making *art* as the Greeks do ἔστιν, an Enclitic. In the familiar expression, thinks—I, says—I, etc. the verb becomes a Proclitic, and the pronoun takes the accent. This habit of dropping Accents is a most fruitful source of contractions and abbreviations in most languages. To this we owe our *anight* and *asleep*, for *at night* and *at sleep*, the Hebrews their Affixes and Prefixes, the Latins and Greeks the terminations of their cases and tenses, which are probably latent prepositions and pronouns, the Germans their *zum* for *zu dem*, the French their *au* for *a le*, and the Italians their *colla* and *nella*, for *con ella*, and *in ella*.¹ To conclude, the general principle, upon

any other Grammar, which deviates from the established number of Declensions and Conjugations, as taught and referred to by the Greek Grammarians themselves. There can be but one reason for this deviation, and that is, to assist the Scholar. It is worth while therefore to ascertain how much his labor is abridged by the consolidation of Declensions and Conjugations. If we compare the Accidents in Dr. Valpy's Grammar, with those in the Eton Grammar, and leave out of consideration the notes in both, it may be asserted, that there are not *ten* pages of text to be learned less in one Grammar, than in the other. This therefore is the just amount of labor saved to the pupil. Now let me ask, what is the value of this saving to a boy, whose time is not very precious, and whose memory is fresh and active, and cannot well be too much exercised? But are we sure, that even this saving is a real and clear gain? On the contrary, when he is an adult, and comes to the reading of the Greek Scholiasts, Commentators, and Grammarians, will he not find them perfectly unintelligible in all their grammatical allusions upon the principles of the New Grammar? The old Grammar must be got by heart at last, by those who would understand the old Grammarians, and surely it is much better to learn their Grammar at first, and once for all, at little or no waste of time and trouble, than afterwards at a very great one. It is making two scaffoldings necessary, where one alone might be sufficient. At all events, the Grammars that adopt the new method, should contain short notices of the old system of conjugations and declensions. Dr. V. would leave little to desire, if he attended to this suggestion in a future edition.

¹ Antonini in his dictionary calls *Ne*, *preposizione*, in *vice di in*, evidently taking *la*, and not *ella*, to be the article. To clear this doubt, I take the articles *il*, *lo* and *la* to be corruptions of the Latin *illo*, and *illa*, *il* suffering an apocope, and *lo* and *la* an aphæresis. It is only after the preposition *in*, that the extended forms, *illo*, and *illa*, passing into *ello* and

which I have expatiated so widely, that words are defined by Accents, is confirmed by Quintilian, and is neatly delivered in this short sentence. *Est autem in omni voce utique Acuta, sed numquam plus una* Lib. 1. 65. Donatus too speaks to the same effect. *Præpositio separatim adverbis non applicabitur, quamvis legerimus desursum, desubito, derepente, et exinde, et abusque, et dehinc*; sed hæc tanquam *unam* partem orationis sub *uno* accentu pronunciabimus. In Putschio, 1761.

The Latins in imitation of the Greeks introduced the grave accent or final acute on the few oxytons which occur in their language, as I have noticed before. But there is no reason to believe, either from Manuscripts or Inscriptions, that the Greek accentual system was ever generally received into the Latin language. On the contrary the Latin scribes neglected Spirits altogether, and applied frequently the Greek accentual characters to other purposes, than that of accent. Sometimes, as we have noticed already, they applied the common acute to the purpose of denoting quantity, and sometimes as a mere final character to denote the end of each word, without any relation either to quantity or tone. With equal consistency and propriety, (as it will not, I apprehend, be contended, that there is any thing inviolable in these oblique strokes, and which in the nature of things can make them fit signs of one quality in language, more than of another,) the Latin scribes at other times, and on some occasions, seem to make use of the grave or final acute as a mere sign of termination to certain words. We have at least a peculiar instance of the Latin usage of these strokes, in opposition to the Greek usage of them, in the Latin ablatives and genitives, *Famâ* and *Luctûs*. Here the common acute seems placed to show that the syllable is *long by nature*, and the grave or final acute is added to it, to shew that it is *final*. Those only, who will give a Greek accentual power to these oblique strokes, wherever they find them, whether in Greek or out of Greek, and, because they represent accents in Greek, will not allow them to represent any other quality and perform a different office in any other language, can be offended at this Latin mode of Notation. It is in this manner, that the circumflex, which takes place in *famâ*, and *luctûs*, has been a stumbling-block to many modern grammarians, who misapprehending the Latin use of the character, and supposing it to be necessarily characteristic of *tone*, and identified in power with the

ella, like *impious* and *index*, into *empio*, and *endice*, are still preserved, and in this single instance they may be considered as articles. *Ello* is now quite obsolete, but *Ella* is still used as a Nominative Pronoun, and even in the oblique cases by the Poets, as in Tasso,

Matilda il volse, e nutricollo, e intrusse

Nell'arti regie, e sempre ei fù conella. Gie. Lib. Cant. 1. st. 59.

I write therefore purposely *nell' arti*, and not *ne l'arti*, as some Editions have it.

Greek circumflex, have objected to what they did not understand, and have busied themselves with combating a phantom of their own creation. To those who love to see Latin and Greek measured by one standard, it must doubtless be a sort of consolation to reflect, that if in *Famá* and *Luctús* the circumflex is a barbarous notation, yet, when the same words are followed by an enclitic, as in *Famáque* and *Luctúsque*, the circumflex becomes an accental notation, in strict conformity to the canons of Prosody.

Having developed my general doctrine respecting the subserviency of Accents and Spirits to the purpose of reading, and having endeavoured to explain by it some usages peculiar to Greek Orthography, I do not know how I can give a still more forcible impression of the truth of it, than by one short *practical* illustration. For this end I will set down an inscription without accents, stops, or spirits, taken at random from Dr. Clarke's Travels, V. 3, p. 774, exactly as it is found there, except that, to save trouble, I shall express it in small characters instead of capitals. It was discovered at Eleusis on a marble Pedestal, and is as follows.

ηεξαρειοπαγου
βουληκαιηβουλη
τωνφ καιιοδημος
οαθηναιωνκλαυδι
ανμενανδρανκλαυ
διουφιλιππουτου
δαδουχησαντοςθυγατε
ρακλαυδεμοστρατουσεγ
γονοκαιπραξαγορουα
πογονοναρετηςενεκεν.

That is,

Of Areopagus
the council, and the council
of 500, and the people
of the Athenians to Claudi-
a Menandra, of Clau-
dius Philippus the
torch-bearer daugh-
ter, of Claudius Eموstratus grand-
daughter, of Aelius Praxagoras great-
granddaughter, for virtue's sake—

I will now put the stops to it, which will immediately throw some light upon the mass, but still leave it not perfectly discernible in all its parts.

ηεξαρειοπαγου
βουλη, καιηβουλη
τωνφ, καιιοδημος

οαθηναιων, κλαυδι
ανμενανδραν, κλαυ
διουφιλιππουτου

δαδουχῆσαντοςθῦγατρι γονον, αἰλπραξαγόρουα
 ρα, κλαυδεμοστράτουσεγ πογονον, ἀρετῆςενεκεν.

The effect of the stops, it is evident, is only to show the members and divisions of the sentence; they still leave in a state of confusion all the intermediate words. I will now write the inscription over again, and in addition to the stops will add the accents and spirits. The stops may be said to illuminate the general outline, and principal members, but it is only the accents and spirits, that make the minuter parts discernible, and discover each separate feature and lineament.

ἡἐξᾶρεισπάγου
 βουλή, καὶἡβουλή
 τῶνφ', καὶὁδῆμος
 ὁἀθηναίων, κλαυδῖ
 αυμενάνδραν, κλαυ
 δίουφιλίππουτοῦ
 ὁαδουχῆσαντοςθῦ
 γατέρα, κλαυδεμοστράτουεγ
 γονον, αἰλπραξαγόρουα
 πογονον, ἀρετῆςενεκεν.

In this short inscription there are no less than thirteen initial, and four final characters. Who does not immediately perceive the great facility afforded to reading by this simple invention, and that the sentence is not only broken into its component members by stops, but that by the help of accents and spirits every word almost is divided, and distinguished from its companions. If we do not read the lines by the help of accents and spirits quite so well as if they were written in the modern manner with a space between each word, a good deal of this difficulty is imputable to want of use, and would become less, and almost vanish entirely by repeated trials, and continued application to ancient manuscripts. Still, however unaccustomed we are to read by accents, if two persons, one conversant with the doctrine of accents, and the other not, attempt to read the three following verses of Euripides, written without spaces between the words, but properly accented, I have no doubt which will arrive at the end sooner, as every word in them is separated and distinguished by accents and spirits.

ἀρούκῆπαδῶςκαὶγόνῃςπέφυχ' ὅδε,
 ὅςτινέμηνπέποιθενένουρηγῆσι

ψυχῇνκρατῆσειντόντεχόντ' ἀτιμάσας. Hippolytus, 1041.

I have just shown the light, that is thrown into all inscriptions and manuscripts by the application of accents and spirits. As a sort of reverse to this, and as nothing tends more to strengthen a position, than the support derived from contrast, I will now

show a few of the many mistakes that may arise, or have arisen, from the want or neglect of these orthographical instruments. I will begin with a difficulty, that occurs in the preceding inscription. I have considered the letters *κλαυδεμοστρατου* as composing two words, namely, *κλαυδ*, an abbreviation for *κλαυδίου*, and *εμοστράτου*. But I am by no means sure, that I have divided the letters rightly, as *κλαυ* might stand for *κλαυδίου*, and then the last word would be *εμοστρατου*, a name more common, than *εμοστρατος*. The substitution of the epsilon for an eta might be the mistake of the transcriber, as Dr. Clarke has committed a similar error in writing *Θεσεως* for *Θησεως*. vol. 3. p. 351. On the other hand *κλαυ*, I believe, is an unusual abbreviation for *κλαυδιος*. Whichever may be the right reading, it is clear that, had accents and spirits been used in this inscription, the dilemma, whether the word in question be *δημοστρατου* or *εμοστρατου*, that is, whether it begin with a vowel, or a consonant, could not have existed. The presence or absence of the initial spirit would have decided this matter.

I know that Dawes treats all these orthographical distinctions with great levity. In his *Miscellanea Critica*, p. 76, he breaks out in this manner. *Suavissimi Argutiores! verbi notionem accentus sedes, accentus autem sedem verbi notio vicissim determinat! Ni hoc sit in circulo, quod aiunt, disputare, quid tandem esse poterit? This is a sophism unworthy so great a Critic.* Beyond all doubt, the sense, to be collected from the context, and from a knowledge of the subject, is the best and only interpreter of equivocal passages, but, occurring as these do frequently, and almost in every page, is it worth while to let them remain, and occasion, as we proceed, doubt and discussion at every step, when by a stroke of the pen they can be removed? If an Aristarchus has been able to extract from letters a better reading, than what has been commonly adopted, is it not a great advantage to be able to communicate this reading, to register, as it were, the amendment, and to prevent a relapse into error by the expeditious and simple means of notation? Does he mean to say, that while all other arts are brought to perfection by adopting from time to time such aids as experience suggests, Orthography is a thing to be let alone, and incapable of receiving any improvement? Was it commendable in the old Greeks not to trust to the sense only to know, whether *ΑΙΟΙΟΙ* be a dative singular, or a nominative plural, but to determine this matter by the invention of a new character, omega, and could it be wrong in the later Greeks to put an end to difficulties attending other words by the invention of other characters equally decisive? I will not deny that these distinctions have been multiplied sometimes beyond the due occa-

sion for them, so as to breed disgust in men of taste, intent on more important matters, and that it is to be regretted that grammarians have not always imposed on themselves the caution inculcated to Poets,

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus.

I will now proceed to the notice of a singular mistake, that occurs in the psaltéry, from a wrong division of the letters. In the first psalm, at the 4th verse, there is the following line.

ἀλλ' ἦ ὡς ὁ χνοῦς, ὃν ἐκρίπτει ὁ ἀνεμῶς,

I conceive that there may be two errors in it, occasioned by a misarrangement of the letters, as they are exhibited in the copy of the psaltéry by Sedulius Scottus before referred to. In Sedulius Scottus the line is thus written, and divided,

αλλη. ως. ηχνοῦς. ον. εκριπτη. (sic) ο. ανεμῶς (sic).

The first blunder is in Sedulius, who has wrongly divided the three letters *ωση*, and made out of one word two, namely out of *ωση*, *ως η*. The right word indeed is *ῶσει*, corruptly written after the fashion of the middle ages *ῶσῆ*, of which corruption another instance occurs in the very same line, *ἐκρίπτη* being put in like manner for *ἐκρίπτει*. Montfaucon (*Palæogr.* p. 238) has improved upon this blunder, and supposing the *η* to be a false concord, has substituted *ὁ* the masculine article before *χνοῦς*, in his explanation of the text. It is however, I think, impossible to suppose, that any person could be so negligent, as to write *ἦ χνοῦς ὃν ἐκρίπτει*, with the *feminine* article immediately before the noun, and with a *masculine* relative pronoun immediately succeeding it. This amendment, however, of Montfaucon's is as old as the Alexandrine Manuscript of the Psaltéry, now, fortunately for the literary world, made public by the care of Mr. Baber, where *χνοῦς* in capitals appears distinctly enough.

Again the Alexandrine Manuscript has *αλλη*, which may be either one word, or two words, either *ἄλλῃ*, or *ἀλλ' ἦ*, for the *iota* subscript is neither expressed in this manuscript, nor in that of Sedulius. But Sedulius, who puts a dot at the end of every word to distinguish it from its companions, gives us plainly *ἄλλῃ* as one word, and this I submit is the true reading, and makes the best sense.

Upon the whole the reading in the manuscript of Sedulius, *ῶσει χνοῦς* is just as good as *ὡς ὁ χνοῦς*, which is in the Alexandrine and common copies, and the other reading of *ἄλλῃ* for *ἀλλ' ἦ* seems preferable.

In the manuscript of Sedulius the letters are all right, but a dot has been misplaced after *ὡς*, which ought to have been placed after *ῶσῆ*. If we read it in this manner,

αλλη. ωση. χνοῦς. ον. εκριπτη ο. ανεμῶς

that is, aliâ ratione (scelesti sunt) sicut gluma, quam projicit ventus, there is not only no error, and no need of any correction, but perhaps too the best sense is afforded, and the true text restored.

There can be little doubt also that the mistake of ἐνδιδέσκειν ἥδῃ for ἥ δ᾽εἶ, which Boyle fell into in his edition of Phalaris, and which the sagacious Bentley preys upon with triumphant humor,¹ originated in a wrong division of letters. In some old manuscript, written in capitals without accents, now perhaps no longer extant, but the parent of more modern manuscripts, the characters were these ΗΔΗ, the final η being substituted, as usual, for the diphthong αι. These characters some copyists understood properly, and, when they transcribed the capitals into small characters, with all the apparatus of accents, spirits, and stops, divided the three letters into two words ἥ δ᾽εἶ while other copyists, more attentive to the letters, than the sense, wrote it as one word ἥδῃ. If this conjecture as to the origin of the mistake is true, and the foundation of it was laid in the old manner of writing in capitals without accents, it is a circumstance, that furnishes an additional argument in confirmation of the antiquity of these forged Epistles of Phalaris, since there is no example, I believe, of any Greek manuscript in capitals of a date posterior to the eighth century.

It is so difficult to read and divide always rightly letters, when totally destitute of auxiliary characters, that the accurate and experienced Montfaucon has himself sometimes fallen into an error. In an Inscription in his *Diarium Italicum*, p. 53, he gives the following line according to his explanation of the original letters,

ἐν ᾧ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ τ' ἐχούτι παρέδου,

and renders it thus :

in quo spiritum tuum *habenti ipsum* commendasti ;

But in his *Palæographia* he divides the letters τῷ τ' ἐχούτι more properly, and to the great improvement of the sense, into these words, τῷ τεχόντι, and thus translates it,

in quo spiritum tuum *Patri* commendasti.

Having just seen that the greatest scholars, and those most conversant with manuscripts, are not always on their guard against mistakes, I shall not, I trust, be thought censorious, if I take the liberty of pointing out an error in a late publication by Mr. Gaisford, entitled, *Notitia Manuscriptorum*, especially as this error may not attach to the learned Editor, but is probably that of the manuscript itself.

I will transcribe the whole distich, as it exhibits in a small compass three observable qualities ; a wrong division of letters into

¹ Bentleii opuscula, Lipsiæ, 1781, p. 32.

words, an almost indiscriminate substitution of η, ει, and ι, one for the other, and syllabic metre, or rather verse, (for metre it is none) without regard to quantity.

The lines, as printed, p. 9, are these,

ἡ μὲν χειρὶ ἡ γράψασα σπένεται τάφῳ.
εἰ δὲ θεία βύβλος εἰς αἰῶνα μένη.

That is, according to present orthography,

ἡ μὲν χεὶρ ἡ γράψασα σήπεται τάφῳ.
ἡ δὲ θεία βύβλος εἰς αἰῶνα μένει.

If there can be any doubt whether this be the right reading, it must disappear on reference to Montfaucon's Palæogr. p. 292, where the first line occurs nearly in the same words, but so arranged as to make metre, while the second line is spun out into a *politic* or *vulgar verse*, resembling that of the modern Greeks, consisting of fifteen syllables, divided into Hemistichs, one of eight and the other of seven syllables,

¹ Iyc in his Grammatica Gothica prefixed to the Gothic gospels of Benzelius p. 30, observes justly, *I* initialis est vocis aut syllabæ: at I adhaeret precedenti literæ. Sic in Alexandrino N. T. codice MS. memini olim me legisse, *ΙΑΤΡΟΤ. ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟ. ΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ. ΕΞΙΓΓΑΝΤΟ. ΠΡΩΤ.* I will add, that as the initial *I* sufficiently distinguishes the beginning of words, the initial *l*ene is therefore in many manuscripts omitted. v. Greg. de Dialectis, Lipsiæ, 1811, p. 590. In like manner *Ῥ* or *ρ* serves not only the same purposes as *Ἰ*, but sometimes also a *third* purpose, namely that of distinguishing the *consonant* u or Beta, pronounced by the modern Greeks, and probably by those of the middle ages like our v, from the *vowel* Upsilon. Thus in Montfaucon's Palæographia p. 282, *ελαυόμεν* occurs for *ελαβομεν*, and in the Alexandrine MS. p. 555 *parauiola*, for *parabola*. This equivalency, and consequent commutation of the Upsilon and Beta has been a fruitful source of doubt, especially as to the right pronunciation of proper names, and to this day whether we ought to write *Σαυτῆ, Δαυιδ*, etc. or *Σαβῆ, Δαβιδ*, &c. "Grammatici certant, et adhuc sub iudice lis est."

My own conjecture is, that the ancient Greeks, and even those under the Ptolemies acknowledged no other power in the Upsilon than that of the vowel sound; but that subsequently it became hardened, when placed between two vowels, into the consonant V, and finally was converted into the letter B, to prevent equivocation. The modern Greeks, it is well known, pronounce Upsilon as a consonant, in many cases, as in *βασιλεὺς* and *αὐτὺς*, and it is probable that from *αὐτὺς*, pronounced like *altus* or *aptus*, is derived the Latin *ipsus*, or *ipse*, and from *ἐαυτοῦ*, *suapte* and *suopte*. On the contrary the Latins in other words have preserved the vowel sound, as in *dōmui*, *necui*, *monui*, *posui*, contracted from *domavi*, *necavi*, *monevi*, *posivi*, etc. and in the poetic words *dissoluit* and *siluit*. Porson in his *Addenda* to the *Medea* of Euripides, v. 1106, takes notice of this custom of placing two points over the letters I and T, but has not explained the use of them.

ἡ χεὶρ μὲν ἡ γραψασα σήπετε (l. σήπεται) τάφῳ,
 γραφεῖ (l. γραφῇ) δέ. μένη (l. μένει) πρὸς χρόνους πολλούς, δόξα τῷ
 Θεῷ.

But to no purpose is the application of spirits and accents more valuable than to the illustration of ancient inscriptions. The following Epigram, taken from Dr. Clarke's Greek Marbles (P.5) which the learned Editor seems to despair of translating, will lose much of its supposed difficulty, if not all, by the simple method of clothing the text with accents, and spirits.

Τειμόθεος ἡπάτρας ὅσιν ἑώσπαῖς δὲ Δασεῖος
 Τρεῖς δὲ κάτας ἐτέαντε ρηματίσας ἑθάνες
 Ἀτάλανοι κτεῖρω στεπολυκλαύστῳ ἐπιτύμβῳ
 Πόνδ' ἐσὺν ἡρώων χῶρον ἔχοις φθίμενος.

According to the orthography of the middle ages, *τειμόθεος* occurs for *τιμόθεος*, *τρεῖς* for *τρεις*, and *δεκάτας* for *δεκάδας*. By a like change of letter the Italians have made their Torso from Dorsum.

The Epigram may be thus translated into Latin.

Timotheus, patriæ sacra lux, Dasique propago,

Triginta annorum tempora mensus, obis.

Te, miser, ad tumultum miseror sine fine dolendum;

Mortuus Heroum sed loca pulchra colas.

Enough has been said by this time, and perhaps more than enough, to prove the value of accents and spirits as auxiliaries to the art of reading, and as a mode of *verbal* punctuation, if I may so call it, in opposition to common punctuation, which is only *sentential*. Never had there been a greater obligation conferred on the literary world, than by the invention of accents, at the time of their introduction; and although the subsequent invention of printing has superseded the old method of reading by accents, and has by spaces between words, and other devices, rendered the process of reading still more unembarrassed and rapid, still we, who enjoy these superior advantages, ought not to be unmindful of our Grammatical Precursors, and of the great Founder and Father of orthography, Aristophanes of Byzantium.—All antiquity concurred in paying him just honor; but modern Grammarians, not understanding the full scope of his design, have holden both him and his invention cheap, and in Chalmers' Universal Biography, a repository, where every son of fame might expect to find admission, not a niche is allowed to his memory. A single friend, however, and one *πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων*, Dr. Foster of Eton, with a zeal worthy of his learning, and characteristic of a true scholar, has vindicated the character of Aristophanes and expatiated on his merit. He has concluded a long and animated defence of him, and his labors, by declaring "that Posterity hath been more truly and essentially benefited by

the ingenuity of this learned Greek, than by the writings of any one profane author of antiquity." ' When the learned writer passed this encomium, he was himself only imperfectly acquainted with the extent of the utility of Aristophanes' inventions. He considers him chiefly as the inventor of common punctuation, of those marks, that indicate the division of *sentences* into colons and commas. But I have shown in a preceding part of this paper, that a species of punctuation was practised in Aristotle's time, and that this art therefore is not an invention of Aristophanes, although it is probable that it received from his skill and ingenuity very great improvement. The principal ground of Aristophanes' title to the gratitude of posterity is his invention of the *accentual marks*, and his happy adaptation of them to the *double* purpose of denoting tone, and the division of words. This division of words is infinitely more useful, because of more frequent occurrence, and therefore more wanted, than the division of sentences. Those, who are conversant with inscriptions, and ancient unaccented manuscripts, and who know by experience the great fatigue and the great difficulty of reading, or rather of decyphering and unriddling a long line of letters, arrayed without any discrimination of words, or periods, are alone capable fully to represent to their imagination what must have been the condition of readers before the invention of stops, spirits, and accents, and can alone appreciate the immense saving of time and trouble gained principally by the improvements and inventions of Aristophanes. To him therefore, to the revered name of Aristophanes, who may be said to have brought to light not only Philosophy, but Poetry, and History, and all that is valuable in every department of literature, I do not hesitate to apply this affectionate apostrophe of Lucretius,

E tenebris tantis tam claram extollere lucem
 Qui primus potuisti, illustrans commoda vitæ,
 Te sequor, O Graiæ gentis decus, inque tuis nunc
 Fixa pedum pono pressis vestigia signis.

I had written the whole of this essay, and prepared almost the whole of it for the press, when, in a friend's library, I met with Reizius de Prosodiæ Græcæ Accentus Inclinatione. On looking into the work, p. 3, I find two reasons assigned by him for the deposition of the acute accent in oxytons, and for the representation of it by a grave. One is, that the reader should be reminded by this mark, that the acute has not been omitted by mistake, and that the introduction of the grave should operate as a caution not to give an acute to any preceding syllable. Another reason

¹ On accent, p. 101.

it, that if no accent whatever were given to an oxyton, it would seem to form part of the ensuing word, and to coalesce with it. To prevent this effect, the grave is introduced, not as a tone, either elevating or depressing the voice, but as a direction, that the final syllable is to be pronounced more strongly and fully than the rest. He explains his meaning by the following illustration.

Unum clarissimum in particula *ὦς* exemplum habemus. Ea carens accentu gravis est per se, atque adeo pronunciatur ut pars vocabuli quod proxime sequitur. Eadem acuta, *ὦς*, pro *ὦντας*, quum in appositione acutum in gravem convertit, nisi pronunciatur et sine ulla tenoris elevatione, et sono tamen impulsu validius, oratio fit obscura. Nam si quis hanc particulam in his aut similibus verbis, *ὦς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπεβήσατο*, cum tenoris elevatione pronunciat, is videbitur verba disjunctisse, atque hoc dicere voluisse, *Ita : ergo locutus abiit*. Sin gravat quidem illam, sed non pronunciat sono magis intento, periit, quod erat inter *ὦς ἄρα* et *ὦς ἄρα* discrimen. Putabimus hoc dici, *Ut igitur locutus abiit*, et membrum consequens expectabimus : frustrati, sero intelligemus non hoc dici, sed illud, *Sic igitur locutus abiit*. Ergo et particula hæc, et ejus exemplo ultima quæque syllaba, gravis ex acuta facta, eo pronuncianda sono est, qui aures paullo plus impleat, quam is quo ceteræ syllabæ graves pronunciantur. p. 4.

There is something in this hypothesis very ingenious, and even specious, but I shall not stop to examine into the truth of it, as the learned author himself abandons it, and adopts another hypothesis more agreeable to my own.

P. 62, He has the following observation. Pagina 3. quas duas causas attuli, cur syllaba ultima tenore acuto, in constructione amisso, nota insigniretur gravis tenoris, eas quum non satis idoneas judicarem, quærenti mihi amplius, videbatur ejus rei verior causa hæc esse, quod olim ita scribebant, ut omnia vocabula inter se nexa cohererent, nec ullo intervallo posterius a priore distaret. Quum ergo semel introducta esset consuetudo scribendi accentus, quoniam videbant eam rem etiam ad singula vocabula dirimenda opportune inservire, ideo in syllaba ultima quæ acutum deposuisset, gravem utique notandum putaverunt. Itaque hodie, quum in scribendo vocabulorum interstitia fieri soleant, accentus gravis omnitti sane posset, ut etiam spiritus lenis.

When I came to this passage, I could not help exclaiming to myself, Euge, dexter, scopum attigisti ! not without feeling at the moment a little chagrin, and the force of the sentiment, *Malè sit illis qui ante nos nostra dixerunt*. But as truth only is my object, it is always welcome, whencesoever it may proceed, and I cheerfully yield the merit of the discovery, on which I had plumed

myself a little, to this learned German. It is indeed a satisfaction to me to find my own opinion confirmed by that of so eminent a scholar, who has paid the greatest attention to all that concerns prosody and metre. My only surprise is, that afterwards, p. 66, he seems disposed to relapse into his first opinion, and to consider the introduction of the grave as a mere caution to young scholars, that they are to abstain from giving to the words marked with it an acute. His words are, Itaque consultum veteres arbitrabantur, ut animi labor tironi minueretur, oculis ejus objicere signum consopendi acuti. Videbant enim, si omisso eo signo tironem ipsam ratiocinari oporteret, dictionem gravandam esse, aut animum ejus hic occupatum aliquid aliud posse, negligere; aut animo ejus alibi occupato, fieri posse, ut consuetudine abreptus dictionem acueret.

Now, with submission to Reizius and many other Grammarians, I contend on the contrary, that there is no such thing as deposition, or consopition of the acute, and that the grave affixed to oxytons is not a negative quality, implying a prohibition of the acute, but a positive quality, and a direction, that it is to be pronounced as an acute, and as an oxyton κατ' ἐξοχήν. Upon any other basis, how many difficulties, perplexities, and contradictions occur, which refuse to admit of any solution, but what is most refined and far-fetched. If ὦ; for οὔτως is an oxyton only at the end of a sentence, but in the middle of a sentence a baryton, then how is it distinguishable, in the name of common sense, from ὦ; without accent to the ear? Reizius found himself oppressed by the weight of this consideration, and has endeavoured, as we have seen, to extricate himself from the embarrassment, by supposing that, although ὦ; and ὦ; are similar in tone, and both grave alike, and equally different from the tone of yet ὦ; is to be distinguished from ὦ;, by a greater volume of voice, and that the latter is to be pronounced *piano*, and the former *forte*. But is not this attributing to Greek accents a power wholly unsupported by any authority, and in contradiction to their quality of tone, which alone they are acknowledged to indicate? In another place, p. 2. Reizius condescends to countenance and adopt, what may be called the common cant of grammarians, who, instead of candidly confessing their ignorance, have invented the most absurd reasons for the expression of a final acute by a grave, but still, it should seem, from the currency, which these reasons have obtained, not too absurd, but good enough, for the generality of their readers. In this strain Reizius gravely asserts, Propter continuum structuræ ordinem cursus pronunciationis debet perpetuus esse, quem interromperet ultima syllaba dictionis mediæ acuendo elata. Herman, who, when he does blunder, seldom does it by halves, plunges much deeper into the mire, and assuming the same principle decides, that an Oxyton in the middle of a sentence requires a grave accent, on

the tyrant's plea of necessity. He says (*De Emendanda Ratione*, etc. p. 65.) "Grammatici quum animadverterent, vocabula oxytona in media oratione minus *posse*, quam in fine orationis acui, quia vehementius acuendis numerum, quo universa oratio continetur, interrumpi *neccesse* esset, ea vocabula gravi, quem vocant, accentu notanda existimarunt." Ἀνάγκη μεγάλη θεός, and Herman thinks so, for he seldom has a difficulty, without applying to her for assistance. But let me ask what becomes of this necessity, when oxytons not only can, but do receive an acute even in the middle of a sentence, in two cases of very frequent occurrence; that is, whenever an oxyton is followed by an Enclitic, and whenever an oxyton declinable suffers an apocope? In the phrase τέρπν' ἔπαθον, is not τέρπν' so placed an oxyton? Do not many barytons also become oxytons by apocope, in effect, although not in name, as in this line

Ἥλιος θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς, καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις?

Now if in the preceding words τέρπν', and πάντ', thus apostrophized, the common or proper acute, instead of the final acute, is preserved, it is not because these words are not oxytons in effect as much as *τερπνά* and *καὶ*, but because the final syllable of these words being demonstrated, *first* by the apostrophus, and *secondly* by the initial lene immediately succeeding; a *third* mark of the same tendency, or the introduction of the final acute, has been thought superfluous. In the *Medea* by Lascaris a double sign does occur, whether by design or accident I know not, for he gives παντὶ τ' ἀνθρώπων, with a *final acute* before the enclitic τ' apostrophized, and not παντί τ' ἀνθρώπων. Vide Porsoni *Addenda*, &c. p. 2. l. 3.

The simple truth is, that the acute has two characters, one common or proper, and the other final, and that its power is precisely the same under all circumstances, whether represented by the acute proper, or the grave. The grave, or as I call it, the final acute, is the characteristic of oxytons, and is uniformly applied to them, except either when their last syllable ceases to be a final quality, as being incorporated with some enclitic, or when its final quality is otherwise sufficiently demonstrated, by a full stop, comma, close of a verse, apostrophus, or some other equivalent sign of separation. In the former case the use of the final acute is improper, in the latter superfluous. When an oxyton becomes a real grave, and loses its power, it is then very properly destitute of accentual marks, as in παρ' ἀνθρώπου. In this case the preposition becomes a proclitic, and forms with its principal but one word.

DE LECTIONE Κηροπλάστας IN ARCHILOCHI
FRAGM. AP. PLUTARCHUM.

F. H. BARKERI *Epistola ad Th. Gaisfordium, Gr.*
Ling. Profess. Reg. Oron.

Abunde laborum meorum fructum percepero, si tibi, doctissime Gaisfordi, quicquid est hujus laboris, probare possim. Vellem equidem te meliore aut grandiore dono prosequi! Quæ a nobis infeliciter tentata, ea tibi explicanda relinquimus. Tu quantum ab eruditione potes in illis animadvertendis, tantum ab æquanimitate poteris in excusandis. “Tria, quæ in scriptore requiruntur, in tuis operibus animadverto, doctrinam, diligentiam, candorem: paucos invenias, in quibus hæc tria concurrunt: duo priora in paucissimis: tertium tanto laudabilius, quanto in hoc ævo rarius.” Vale.

Thetfordiæ Non. Octobr. MDCCCXV.

“J. Pollux II. 31. Καὶ κομμώτραι αἱ γυναῖκες· οἱ δὲ καὶ κεροπλάστας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι κέρας ἡ κόμη: inepte Pollux; scribendum enim κερατοπλάστας. Κεροπλάστας tamen agnoscit Hesych. (κεροπλάστης· λεπτουργός, ἢ τριχοκοσμητής). Sed vera lectio est κηροπλάστας: quippe κηρὸς est fucus muliebris: hinc κηρίναι, *faciinae, quæ faciunt κηρῷ illinunt.* Quare κομμώτραι et κηροπλάσται eadem sunt. Hesych. Κηρίωμα· ὀμίλημα: leg. κηρίωμα· μίλτωμα: nam μίλτος est cerussa, qua utuntur mulieres: vel pro κηρίωμα fortasse leg. ὀμρίωμα.” Toupjii *Emendd. in Suid.* T. iv. p. 363. ed. 1790.

Fallitur Tourpius, cum dicit J. Pollucem scribere debuisse *κερατοπλάστας* pro *κεροπλάστας*: Οἱ δὲ καὶ *κεροπλάστας* αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι *κέρας* ἢ *κόμη*. Nam *κερατοπλάστας* fit per contractionem *κεροπλάστας*. Hesych. *Κεροβάτης*· ὁ Πάν' ἦτοι ὅτι *κέρατα* ἔχει· ἢ οἰονεὶ *Κερατοβάτης*, τὴν βάσιν ἔχων *κερατίνη*. Iterum Hesych. *Μελίσφυλλον*· *βοτάνη τις*, δ καὶ *Μελισσόφυλλον*, καὶ *Πράσιον*. "*Melissophyllum* a Plinio dicitur, unde *melisphyllum* videtur per syncopen a Virgilio dictum," Forcellinus in v. E voce *ἐπικόπανον*, per contractionem venit *ἐπίκοπον*: "Ἐπικόπανον, an ἐπίκοπον dicas, nullum interest discrimen," T. Hemsterh. ad Luciani Dial. Mort. T. i. p. 371. Sic *κολοβός* est per contractionem *κόλος*, unde fit, ut unum per alterum exponatur: Hesych. *Κόλος*· *κολοβός*.

Fallitur quoque Tourpius, cum pro *κεροπλάστας* ap. Pollucem scribat *κηροπλάστας*: J. Pollux l. c. Καὶ κομμάτριοι αἱ γυναῖκες· οἱ δὲ καὶ *κεροπλάστας* αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι *κέρας* ἢ *κόμη*: hic locus sanissimus est. Hesych. *Κεροπλάστης*· *τριχοκοσμητής*. Plutarch. de Solert. Animal. p. 976. Ἐπεὶ τὴν ὁρμίαν οὐ ποιοῦσι πολὺπλοκον, τοῖς ~~ἔμ~~μασι τῶν βρόχων, οὐδὲ *τραχεῖαν*· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ δόλου γίνεται ~~τεκμήριον~~ αὐτοῖς· καὶ τῶν *τριχῶν* τὰ καθήκοντα πρὸς τὸ ἀγκιστρῶν, ὡς ἐνι μάλιστα λευκὰ φαίνεσθαι *μηχανῶνται*· μᾶλλον γὰρ εὖτως ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ δι' ὁμοιότητα τῆς *χρῆας* *λανθάνουσι*· τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λεγόμενον· "*Ἢ δὲ μολυβδαῖ· ἡ ἱκέλη ἐς βυσσὸν ὄρουσεν*" "*Ἢ το κατ' ὕψους βὸς* *κέρας ἐμβεβαυῖα*" *Ἐρχεται ὠμηστῆσιν ἐπ' ἰχθύσι κῆρα φέρουσα*· *παρὰ κούροντες*· ἐνιοι βοεῖαις θριξὶν οἶονται πρὸς τὰς ὁρμῖας *χρῆσθαι* τοὺς παλαιούς· *κέρας* γὰρ τὴν *τρίχα* λέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ *κεῖρασθαι* διὰ τοῦτο, καὶ τὴν *κευράν* καὶ τὸν *παρ'*· *Ἀρχιλόχῳ* *Κηροπλάστην*, *φιλόκοσμον* εἶναι περὶ *κόμην* καὶ *καλλωπιστήν*· ἐστὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀληθές· *ἱππείαις* γὰρ *θριξὶ* *χρῶνται*, τὰς τῶν ἀβρῶνων *λαμβάνοντες*· αἱ γὰρ θήλειαι τῷ οὖρῳ τὴν *τρίχα* *βεβεργμένην* ἀδρανῆ ποιοῦσιν. Cf. Gaisfordii *Poet. min.* V. i. p. 316., ubi mirum est doctissimum et accuratissimum virum retinere corruptam vocem *κηροπλάστην*, praesertim cum de ea Wytenbachius scripsisset: "*Immo κεροπλάστην*, ut notavit Salmas. et jam antea Jun. T. v." Hesych. *Κέρας*· *κεφαλὴ*, *θρίξ*. J. Pollux l. c. καὶ κομμάτριοι αἱ γυναῖκες, οἱ δὲ καὶ *κεροπλάστας* αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι *κέρας* ἢ *κόμη*· δ καὶ "*Ὀμηρον* *δηλοῦν* *τινες* *ἔφασαν*, *εἰπόντα* *τὸν Πάριν*, *Κέρ'* *ἀγλαόν*· *ὅθεν* καὶ *παρὰ* *Σόφοκλει*, *Ὀρθόκερως* *Φρίκη*, *οἷον* *ὀρθόθριξ*, καὶ *κέρας* *βὸς*, τὴν *τρίχα*. Hesych. *ὀρθόκέρως*· *ὀρθόθριξ*: cf. Phot. Lex. Ms. Hesychius: *Κέρα*

κέρατα, τρίχες: Κέρα ἀγλαέ' τὴν τρίχα λαμπρὴ τῷ τόξῳ ἀγαλλόμενε. Schol. Venet. ad II. A, 385. κέρα ἀγλαέ' ἡ διπλῇ, ὅτι κέρα, οὐ τῇ τριχὶ φιλωῶς, ἀλλ' ἐμπλοκῇς τι γένος· εἰς κέρατος τρόπον ἀνεπλέκοντο οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. Cf. Suid. in v. Iterum, Schol. Venet. B. Σπανιὸν ἐστὶν ἐπ' ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως παρὰ τῷ Πιπιτῇ τὸ κέρας ἐπὶ τριχὺς τάσσεσθαι κόμην δὲ λέγει καὶ τρίχας καὶ πλοκάμους καὶ θείζας. Apollon. Lex. Homer. p. 394. ed. Toll. Οἱ μὲν γλωσσογράφου, ταῖς θριξὶν ἀγαλλόμενε· κέρα γάρ, τὴν τρίχα λέγεσθαι· ὃ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κυρίως ἀκούει τὸ τοῦ βοῦς κέρας, οἶον τὸ κεράτιον, συρίγγιον· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρῶξαι τὸν ἰχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιτίθεσθαι τοῦτο· τὸν δὲ Ὀμηρον μηδέποτε εἰρηκέναι κέρας, τὴν τρίχα· ὅθεν ἐπὶ τοῦ κέρ' ἀγλαέ, τόξῳ ἀγαλλόμενε. Iterum p. 196. Βοὺς κέρας (II. Ω. 81.). ἔτοι περικείμενον τῇ ὀρμιᾷ κέρας ὑπὸ τὸ ἀγκίστρον, ἵνα μὴ ἀποτρῶγῃ ὁ ἰχθύς· ἔτι δὲ, τὴν τρίχα, κέρας, ubi Villosius. "Revera ap. Hesych. τρίχα κέρας: Plutarch. de Sole et Animal. post Aristotelem contendit, κέρας significare cornu quod hamo praefigebatur: et Anna Daceria inde quoque factum opinatur, ut κέρας vocaverint pilum Lovinum, quod post cornu deinde adhibitus fuerit pilus." Mirum est Villosionum non vidisse, Plutarchum l. c. ipsissima Aristarchi verba usurpare, ideoque in Plutarcho pro Aristotele legendum esse Aristarchum. Judicet lector. Apollonius habet: ὃ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κυρίως ἀκούει τὸ τοῦ βοῦς κέρας οἶον τὸ κεράτιον, συρίγγιον· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρῶξαι τὸν ἰχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιτίθεσθαι τοῦτο. Plutarchus iisdem fere verbis p. 977.: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ φησι μηδὲν ἐν τούτοις λέγεσθαι σοφὴν ἢ περιττὴν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι κεράτιον περιτίθεσθαι πρὸ τοῦ ἀγκίστρος περὶ τὴν ὀρμιάν, ἔπειτα πρὸς ἄλλο ἐρχόμενοι διασθίσουσιν. Schol. Venet. ad II. Ω. 81. (loc. a Plutarcho supra adductum): Βοὺς κέρας· ἡ διπλῇ, ἔτι οὐ λέγει βοὺς κέρας, βοὺς τρίχα, διὰ τὸ τριχινὴν εἶναι τὴν ὀρμιάν· λίναι γὰρ ἐχρῶντο. Ἐκ πόντοιο θυράζε λίνῳ ἐν οἴνοπι χάλκῳ· οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐδὲ βοείαις χρῶνται, ἀλλὰ ἱππέαις· λέγοι ἂν οὖν βοὺς κέρας κυρίως· κατεσκεύαζον γὰρ σύριγγα ἐκ κέρατος βεβίου, ἣν παρετίθησαν τῇ ὀρμιᾷ ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀγκίστρον, ὅπως μὴ οἱ ἰχθύες ἀποτρῶγῳσι τὸν λίνον. Iterum Schol. Venet. B. Κέρας· ὃ προσάπτουσι τῇ ὀρμιᾷ, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐσθίεσθαι καὶ ὁμόχροον εἶναι τῇ θαλάσσῃ· οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι, κέρας, τὴν συμπλοκὴν τῶν τριχῶν. Cf. Plutarchi verba. ¹

¹ Lectio κροπλάστη; Caelio Rhodigino quoque placuit. "Scribunt nonnulli ex grammaticis Græcis, cornua item pro capillis posita inveniri, quoniam

Latini eodem modo *cornua* usurpant. “Juvenalis de Gerniano, *Madido torquentis cornua cirro*. *Cornua* vocat *longus crinium sertas*, quæ torquentur, ut in nodum mitti possint: Græci et *κέρατα* appellant: inde et *cornua* et *crines* in fluminibus, τὸ πολυσχιδές, et *rami*.” Salmas. in *Solin.* p. 535, E.: vide et p. 704, C. “In galeis *cornua* sunt ornamenta in modum cornu, vel comæ in cornu assurgentes, quæ cristam apicemque exornant, quæ a Græcis quoque *κέρατα* dicuntur: proprie autem sunt *cincinni*. Ita Serv. ad *Æn.* xii. 89. *Ensemque clypeumque, et rubræ cornua cristæ*. Liv. xxvii. 33. *In arborem illatus impetu equi, ad eminentem ramum cornu alterum galeæ perfregit*.” Forcellinus.

utraque enascantur modo eodem. Credo, quia ungues, rostra, pili, cornua, plectra, sive calcaria, et si quid ejusmodi aliud est, ex cibo gignuntur adventitio et augendi potestatem habente, quem tum a fœmina, tum forinsecus sibi acquirunt. Ossa vero in prima partium constitutione gignuntur ex seminali excremento, quomque animal augetur, hæc incrementum ex alimento capiunt naturali, quo partes augentur principales. Adest etymon quoque, cur *cerata* pro *capillis* autument inveniri; inde enim duci videtur nomen, ὅτι συνῶς κίρονται, i. e. quod præcidantur assidue. *Ceraæos* et *ceratoglyphos* appellant Græci, qui *cornua expoliunt excoluntque artifices ingenio, ac sculpunt*; sicuti concinnandæ comæ periti, plurimum quidem *comotæ* dicuntur, i. e. κομῶται, et *fœmina comotrix*. Sed et *ceroplastæ* vocantur, quoniam (ut præstruximus) *comas* etiam *cerata* vocabant, unde de Paride ap. Hom. κίρ' ἀγλαόν, i. e. *coma illustrem tenustumque* interpretantur. Et ap. Sophoclem ὀρθοκίρως φρίκη, pro eo quod est ὀρθοκίριξ, et *κίρας βοός*, pro *setis* intelligunt *bubulis*.” Lectt. antiq. xxx. 1. Hadrianus Junius in Comment. de Coma sic scribit p. 431. “Quin et *κίρας* veteribus *capillitium* notat, quo sensu κίρ' ἀγλαόν Paridem nominat, sed convicio, Homerus, quod ad inescandas et ad stuprum sollicitandas virgines *coma* lasciviret; tametsi Herodotus et Appion grammatici in istum Homeri locum annotant, esse quoddam plexus crinium genus, instar cornu effigiati, unde illi nomen: variis siquidem modis ornare capillos satagebant majores, quemadmodum plenius dicetur postea: alioqui *κίρας* dixisse illos simpliciter, ostendunt voces κίρισθαι, i. e. *tonderi*, et κίρᾱ, *tonsura*, quas a *κίρας* derivari vult gravissimus auctor Plutarchus, Archilochus etiam κίροπλάστην nominante *hominem ornandæ comæ et componendæ studiosum*. Potest et ὀρθοκίρως φρίκη ex Sophocle hujus rei fidem facere, *surrectrix pilorum formido*.”

AN INQUIRY

*Into the Nature and Efficacy of Imitative Versification,
Ancient and Modern.*

"The best in this kind are but shadows, and the bad are no worse if imagination amend them."

MIDSUM. NIGHT'S DREAM.

No. II.

(Continued from No. XXI. p. 123.)

A GOOD poet or orator should take care to imitate his subject not only by the choice of his words, but by the arrangement of them. This is usually done by the divine Homer, who, although he uses but one metre, and few feet, is yet so abundant in novelty, and so skilful, that it matters not whether we behold or read of the events. Ulysses, in telling his adventures to the Phæacians, and speaking of his descent into hell, affords us a view of its evils and among these relates the sufferings of Sisyphus. It is worth while to see how he represents the attending circumstances by imitation and the very arrangement of the words.

Καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖλον, κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα,
 Λᾶαν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρησιν.
 "Ἦτοι, ὁ μὲν σκηριπτόμενος χερσὶν τε ποσὶν τε
 Λᾶαν ἄνω ὥθесκε ποτὶ λόφον,

Od. λ. 592.

I turn'd my eye, and, as I turn'd, survey'd
 A mournful vision, the Sisyphean shade ;
 With many a weary step, and many a groan,
 Up the high hill he leaves a huge round stone.

In these lines the heaviness of the stone, and the labor of moving it, are placed before our eyes by the disposition of the words. We see, also, Sisyphus exerting himself in all his limbs, ascending the hill, and rolling the stone forward with difficulty. The two verses which describe the onward motion of the stone are, with the exception of two words, composed of dissyllables or monosyllables, and the long exceed the short syllables by one half. The flow, also, is sensibly retarded by the collision of the vowels, and the conjunction of the mutes and semi-vowels ; and the passage is composed of dactyls and spondees, having the greatest length and most frequent transit.

The tediousness of the work is exhibited by monosyllables and dissyllables, separated by long intervals from each other ; difficulty and heaviness by the long syllables ; and the interruption arising from the obstacles, and from the greatness of the labor, by the intervals of the words and combination of the harshest letters ; the feet considered as to length represent the extension of his limbs, and resistance of the stone.

This is not the spontaneous effect of nature, but arises from art, as appears from the description of the stone's revolution,

ἀλλ' ὅτε μέλλει
 Ἰκρον ὑπερβαλέει,

corresponds with what precedes, but is followed by

τότ' ἀποστρεψασκε κραταῖς,
 Αὔρις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλινδρετο λάας ἀναιδέης.

Here the collocation of the words rolls down together with the weight of the stone, or rather their swiftness overtakes its descent. The cause of this is, that the verse descriptive of the stone's revolution contains no monosyllable, and only two dissyllables, by which the quantity is not allowed to be prolonged, but is accelerated. Besides, out of seventeen syllables, ten are short, and even the other seven are not perfectly long.¹

The passage which I have omitted is as follows in the original:

There is no hiatus, but all the words seem to be borne along with one common motion. But what is most admirable is, that none of the long feet which may be used in the hexameter, neither spondee, nor bacchius occurs except at the end; for the others are all dactyls, and are so allied to those which are called undefinable, that some do not differ much from trochees. There is nothing to hinder a diction composed of such feet from being swift, and rounded, and flowing.

Such are the observations of Dionysius, in commenting on which, the character of the author must be considered no less than the nature of his evidence.

If we trace the Grecian history, from the poet downward to the Critic, we shall find that the intervening period is not more remarkable for its length than for the importance of the events and the beauty of the writings which ennobled it.

The battles of Marathon, Salamis, and Platæa; the successive ascendancy of Athens, Sparta, Thebes, and Macedon; the conquests of Alexander; the dissensions of his generals, and the pure but transient lustre of the Achæan league, will remind us that the military genius of Greece had achieved its highest honors, and was verging to extinction; while the names of the poets, historians, and philosophers, who flourished during that period, will suffice to prove that the powers of the human mind were never more successfully or gloriously exerted. If such were the events, literary and military, of this period, its length was equally remarkable:

Ἀνάγκη οὖν κατεσπᾶσθαι καὶ συστέλλεσθαι τὴν φράσιν, τῇ βραχυότητι τῶν συλλαβῶν ἐφελερομένην.

Ἐτι πρὸς τοῦτοις οὐδὲ ὄνομα ἀπὸ ἰνόμεματος ἀξιόλογον εἴληφε διάστασιν. οὔτε γὰρ φωνήεντι φωνήεν, οὔτε ἡμιφωνῶν ἡμιφωνῶν ἢ ἄφωνον, ἃ τραχύνην πέφυκε καὶ δισπᾶνειν ἁρμονίας, οὐδὲν ἔστι παρακείμενον.

Notes.—Κατεσπᾶσθαι, nota hic dissimilitudinem temporum in κατεσπᾶσθαι καὶ συστέλλεσθαι. Sylburgius. Erit quidem eadem temporum dissimilitudo, sed verior fortasse lectio, si quis admittendum censeat κατεσπῦσθαι: eo sane utitur Longinus Sect. 39, τῷ τὴν ἁρμονίαν μὴ κατεσπῦσθαι: eo quod numerus non præcipitur. Upton.

Ἄφωνον γίνεται. Forsan, verho γίνεται in sequentem periodum translato, sic legendus locus: οὔτε ἡμιφωνῶν ἡμιφωνῶν ἢ ἄφωνον, ἃ τραχύνην πέφυκε καὶ δισπᾶνειν τὰς ἁρμονίας, οὐδὲν ἔστι παρακείμενον· οὐ ὅγ' διαστάσις αἰσθητὴ γίνεται μὴ διηρημένων τῶν λέξεων. Sylburgius.

Hanc vocem γίνεται e contextu sustuli, plane otiosam, monente etiam Hudsono; cum nec in reg. 1. codice, nec Colb. appareat. Upton.

for no chronologist will deny that eight hundred years must have elapsed between the birth of Homer, and that of Dionysius.*

In other languages, such an interval would have blended, if not identified, the antiquary with the critic; but the language of Homer was unequalled in duration as in excellence, and when Greece finally sunk beneath the arms and policy of Rome, she might still find some consolation in reflecting that her literature survived the ruin of her freedom, and that she retained that superiority in science which she had once possessed in war.

The lapse, therefore, of eight centuries does in no degree disqualify Dionysius for appreciating and illustrating the beauties of his author, although it naturally leads us to inquire if none among the various and unrivalled writers, whom that period comprehended, can be quoted in confirmation of his remarks. We are fully authorized to assert that they could not have been unacquainted with the merits of their national poet; and as we are taught by history and philosophy, that the times which form the soldier and the statesman are more favorable to literature than the enervating quiet of unresisting slavery,² the dweller at Rome can on no account be preferred to the citizens of independent Greece; nor can their silence be compensated by his evidence. Dionysius, however, (unless I am much mistaken) refers to none of the Grecian authors; and though his commentator, Upton, mentions Aristotle and Demetrius Phalereus, we shall derive no assistance from his reference.

The former author certainly says, in his Poetics, that if we substitute *κράζουσιν* for *βοδῶσιν*, the effect will be destroyed; but there seems no reason to conclude, from the context, that he means the imitative effect.

The passage referred to by Upton is as follows:

“Undoubtedly, when these licences appear to be thus *purposely* used, the thing becomes ridiculous. In the employment of *all* the species of *unusual* words, moderation is necessary; for metaphors, foreign words, or any of the others, improperly used, and with a

* According to Blair, and the Arundelian marbles, Homer flourished 907, A. C. according to Newton, 870. Dionysius went into Italy, by his own account, in the middle of the 187th Olympiad, A. C. 30.

² Postquam bellatum apud Actium, atque omnem potestatem ad unum conferre pacis interfuit, magna illa ingenia cessere.—Tacitus, Hist. L. 1. C. 1. Gibbon somewhere remarks, that the age of science has generally been the age of military virtue. In our own history, whether the reign of Queen Anne, or, with greater justice, that of Elizabeth, be accounted our Augustan age, we shall find the same union of literary and military talents; nor has the fact been less strikingly exemplified in the present period.

design to be ridiculous, would produce the same effect. But how great a difference is made by a *proper* and temperate use of such words, may be seen in *heroic* verse. Let any one only substitute *common* words in the place of the metaphorical, the foreign, and others of the same kind, and he will be convinced of the truth of what I say. For example: the same Iambic verse occurs in *Æschylus* and in *Euripides*; but by means of a single alteration—the substitution of a foreign for a common and usual word—one of these verses appears beautiful, the other ordinary.

For *Æschylus*, in his *Philoctetes*, says,

Φαγ-έ-αι. κ. ἤ μου σάακας ἔσθιει πιδός.

The cankerous wound that *eats* my flesh.

But *Euripides*, instead of *ἐσθίει* [*eats*], uses *ΘΙΝΙΤΑΙ*.

The same difference will appear if, in this verse,

Νῦν δέ μ' ἐὼν Ὁ ΠΥΘΩΣ τε καὶ ὈΤΤΙΛΑΝΟΣ καὶ ΑΚΙΚΤΣ,

we substitute *common* words, and say

Νῦν δέ μ' ἐὼν μικρός τε καὶ ὑπερνεκός καὶ ἀειδής.

So, again, should we for the following—

Δίφρον ἀεικέλιον καταβίς, ὀλίγην τε τράπεζαν,

substitute this,

Δίφρον μυχθρὸν καταβίς, μικράν τε τράπεζαν:

or change *Πόντος βοόων*—the cliffs *rebel*—to *Πόντος κράζουσιν*—the cliffs *resound*."

I have only to add, that *Twining*, whose translation I have used, asserts in his first dissertation, that "of the other two senses in which poetry may be, and by modern writers has been, considered as imitation—*resemblance of sound* and *description*—*Aristotle* says nothing."

The other passage referred to by *Upton* occurs in the treatise *περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, and is as follows:

ΟΒ.

Ἦν δὲ τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ χαλεκῶς σύγκρουσις παρ' ἀμβάνοι' ἂν πρῆτιυσα, ἦτοι διὰ μακρῶν, ὥς τῷ, Ἄσαν ἄνω ἄδεσκε' καὶ γὰρ ὁ στίχος μήκεις τε ἔσθ' ἐκ τῆς συγκρούσεως, καὶ μεμίμνται τοῦ λίαν, τὴν ἀναφορὰν καὶ βίαν.

It cannot, therefore, be denied, that the passage is perfectly apposite; although the authenticity of the treatise may well be doubted. *Petrus Victorius* attributes it to the celebrated *Demetrius Phalereus*, on the authority of *Theophylactus*, who lived 1300 years later. *Valesius* ascribes it to *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, on the authority of the scholiast upon *Aristophanes*; and dissents from

* If the Bishop of Landaff's distinction (Letters to Tom Paine) is correct, I should say *genuineness*.

Victorius, because Artemo (who made an index to Aristotle's Epistles, and lived long after the celebrated Demetrius Nicias, the painter, who was contemporary with King Attalus) and Demetrius himself, are mentioned in it. Gerard Vossius says, that the Epistle of Theophylactus, as Victorius himself confesses, is not to be found in the Florentine manuscript, and thinks that the authority of the Scholiast is not to be preferred to that of Ammonius, who mentions the writer of the treatise by the single name of Demetrius. He concludes, therefore, that it was written by a Demetrius; not by him, however, who was surnamed Phalereus, but by the Alexandrian rhetorician. Gale is of the same opinion, and adds, that, if his own positions are correct, the writer's age cannot be unknown, as the Alexandrian Demetrius was contemporary with Galen and Herodes Atticus; but as Vossius¹ has not fixed his age, he himself does not speak confidently.

Of the two authors, therefore, whom Upton quotes, Aristotle is rather for us than against us; and Demetrius, as in all probability he lived long after Dionysius, will weigh but lightly in the balance.

It is not my business to search for authorities against myself, which have not been noticed by my opponents; and when I say that Demetrius, Eustathius, and Dion Chrysostom,² who flourished under Trajan,³ or about one hundred years after Dionysius, are the only Greek writers who countenance Dionysius, I make the assertion not from my own knowledge, but from a conviction that they would not have been quoted by Clarke and others, if better testimony could have been procured. Eustathius flourished, according to Blair, in the twelfth century, and consequently more than two thousand years after Homer. It is not my intention to extenuate the merits of him or Demetrius, nor indeed to offer any remark upon their criticisms; for the authority of Dionysius is so superior to theirs, that they can neither invalidate nor substantiate

¹ De Rhet. Nat. Cap. ix.

² Clarke, in his note upon Iliad Δ, 435, refers to "Dio, Orat. XIII." Unless the orations are differently arranged in different editions, XIII is an error of the press, for I at last found the quotation in the XIIth. Ed. Reiske. The whole passage is too long for insertion, but the following part cannot well be omitted.

"Οὐδενὸς σθόγγου ἀπεχόμενος, ἀλλὰ ἐν βραχεὶ ποταμῶν τε μιμούμενος φωνάς, καὶ ὕλης καὶ ἀνέμων καὶ περὶς καὶ θαλάττης· ἐτι δὲ χαλκοῦ καὶ λίθου, καὶ ξυμπάντων ἀπλῶς ζῶων καὶ ὀργάνων, τοῦτο μὲν θηρίων, τοῦτο δὲ οὐρίων, τοῦτο δὲ αὐλῶν τε καὶ σιγῆγγων· καναχάς τε καὶ βόμβους καὶ κτύπον, καὶ δοῦπον, καὶ ἄραδον πρῶτος ἐξευρών, καὶ οἰομάσας ποταμούς τε μοιμύροντας καὶ βελη κλάζοντα καὶ βοῶντα κύματα, καὶ χαλεπαίνοντας ἀνέμους." Pr. 409, 410.

³ Photius, Cap. ccix "ἤκμασε δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τοῦ βασιλέως Τραιανοῦ."

his assertions by their own, nor can any inference be drawn from their admiration of representative metre as to the opinion of Aristotle or Plato.¹ Should this inquiry attract any notice, I may be enabled to add other names to this meagre list;² but if in the vast range which Grecian literature affords (for we are told that the language was spoken and written with elegance and purity until the downfall of the Eastern empire; and, indeed, it may still, with little impropriety, be called a living language) no witnesses less objectionable can be found, I shall derive no slight encouragement from the circumstance.³

Dionysius is positive and explicit, and has always been held in high estimation. His accuracy, however, as an historian, has been questioned by Hooke; and in some passages of his treatise on composition, he attributes effects so wonderful to causes so incongruous, that we are authorized to suspect his discrimination. The principles of the art, as was mentioned before, are to be sought in the power of single words, and the joint effect of many, in the cadence of verse, and the properties of its feet; and, however skillfully these may be varied and adapted, sound itself can imitate nothing but sound. "Dionysius himself," says Johnson, "tells us, that the sound of Homer's verses sometimes exhibits the idea of corporeal bulk. Is not this a discovery nearly approaching to that of the blind man, who, after long inquiry into the nature of the scarlet color, found that it represented nothing so much as the clangor of a trumpet?"⁴ And again, "Many other instances Dionysius produces; but these will sufficiently show, that either he was fanciful,

¹ Dionysius refers to Plato only as an etymologist.

² The following epigram is written by Cerealius, of whom little or nothing is known.

Οὐ τὸ λέγειν παράτγμα, καὶ Ἀττικὰ ῥήματα πέντε,

Εὐξήλως ἔστιν καὶ φρονίμως μελετᾶν·

Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ κ' ἄρχεις, καὶ εἰ, κόναβεῖ, τὸ τε, σιζεῖ,

Καὶ, κε λ' ἄρχει, λέγεις, εὐδὺς Ὅμηρος ἔστι,

Νοῦν ὑποκείσθαι δεῖ τοῖς γράμμασι καὶ σῖλιν αὐτῶν

Εἶναι κοινοτέραν ὥστε νοεῖν ἂν λέγεις.

Vide *Iliad*, ζ. 399.

Trypho (vide *Museum Criticum*, No. 1) in his Remarks *Περὶ Ὀνοματοποιίας*, says, *πεποιημένον, ὡς τὸ Τετρίγ' ὅτα καὶ Κελαρύζει· καὶ Ἀά· ὄντες γλώσσησι.*

³ It is not unusual, upon any deficiency of evidence, to refer to the Alexandrian grammarians, and to assert that much must have been written, because nothing is extant. With regard to the burning of the Alexandrian library, Gibbon says, "For my own part, I am strongly tempted to deny both the fact and the consequences; the fact is, indeed, marvellous." Whatever these grammarians may have written, it appears that their fame was confined to Alexandria, and that no copy of their works was to be obtained elsewhere.

⁴ *Rambler*, 94.

or we have lost the genuine pronunciation, for I know not whether in any one of these instances such similitude can be discovered."

Lord Kaimies also observes, that, "except in the single case where sound is described, all the examples given by critics of sense being imitated in sound, resolve into resemblance of effects — Emotions raised by sound and signification may have a resemblance; but sound itself cannot have a resemblance to any thing but sound."

If, then, the authorities adduced are insufficient to prove the prevalence of this opinion, the reasoning of Dionysius will hardly remove our scruples, or convince us that the means which versification affords are competent to the alleged effects. In candor, I must add, that Johnson's sentiments are not so favorable as they may seem from the foregoing extracts; for in the 92d number of the *Rambler*, he says, "It is not, however, to be doubted, that Virgil, who wrote amidst the light of criticism, and who owed much of his success to art and labor, endeavoured among other excellences to exhibit this similitude, nor has he been less happy in this than in the other graces of versification." The nicety and minuteness apparently requisite for imitative harmony countenance the preference which is here given to Virgil; and if we assume, that he did endeavour to exhibit this similitude, and was furnished with adequate means, we cannot doubt of his success. His art and labor are evident and unquestionable; but the source of that light of criticism, which directed them in this instance, is not easily to be ascertained.

I have attempted to show that Dionysius is the earliest writer on this subject, and shall now attempt to show, with still less hopes of succeeding, that Virgil was not enlightened by his criticisms. We know that Dionysius came into Italy on the conclusion of the civil war, in the middle of the 187th Olympiad, or about 724 U. C. 30 A. C.; and that when he had lived at Rome twenty-two years, and made himself master of the Latin language and antiquities, he began his work upon the latter.¹ Servius tells us that Virgil wrote the *Bucolics* when he was twenty-eight years old; and Donatus says, that the *Bucolics* were written in three, the *Georgics* in seven, and the *Æneid* in twelve, years; but as their authority has been thought insufficient to establish these dates, I shall only assume as certain, what, I believe, has not been questioned, that he died in his fifty-second year, A. C. 19. U. C. 735. Now, if it could be proved that the *Antiquities* were written prior to the treatise on composition, it must follow that Virgil never read the latter work,

¹ Polyphemus, Achilles, &c.

² Sect. III. Chap. XVIII. Elements of Criticism.

³ Antiq. Rom. 1st book, 6th page, Sylb. ed. Photius, 83d Chap.

as he died about eleven years before Dionysius began the former. But, unfortunately, I have not been able to ascertain the date of this treatise, and must consequently confine myself to conjecture.

The fact of Dionysius devoting twenty-two years to the study of a foreign language, and to the collection of materials for a long and laborious work, allows us to infer with much probability that he left Greece before his fortieth, and perhaps soon after his thirtieth year. Now there are some passages in this treatise which savour of age rather than of youth, for he addresses the Rufus, to whom it is inscribed, and whom Lindenbrogius calls his son, in the language of Homer, as his dear son,

Διόφρον τῆς καὶ ἐγὼ. τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι.

a quotation which presupposes a considerable difference of years between the two persons: Rufus, moreover, had arrived at manhood; Dionysius promises him another treatise if the Gods should preserve his life; and it appears that he was then teaching rhetoric at Rome.¹ There is, therefore, presumptive evidence for concluding that this treatise was written in that city, and that the writer was advanced in years.

Since, then, Virgil, as was mentioned before, died A. C. 19, or about eleven years after the arrival of Dionysius, he could not have profited by his criticisms, if these conclusions are valid. There is, however, one reason for supposing that they were written at an earlier period, which must not be omitted.

¹ It was written before De ad. vi dic. Dem., as it is twice referred to in that work. Mr. Mitford says, in his note upon the funeral oration of Demosthenes, vol. 8. p. 464: "Dionysius himself, and all other Greeks, and their fathers and grandfathers, had been living under Roman despotism. Possibly his youth might see the last convulsions of the Roman Republic, when it most despotically commanded the civilized world; but no free government was ever within the scope of his conversation." If the extensive reading of Mr. Mitford has not enabled him to speak with confidence upon the age of Dionysius, it is not probable that other authors will succeed in their inquiries.—The following extract from the Quarterly Review (No. 21, April) will suffice to show the slow circulation of the best works before the invention of printing: "Yet more to extenuate his faults, and exalt his beauties, it is right to remember that Petrarch's genius was as strictly circumscribed as that of Dante. In that early age of literature the multiplication of copies was slow and uncertain, and we have the authority of Petrarch himself, that the great work of his immortal predecessor was, to a considerable degree at least, unknown to him until a late period of his poetical career."

² Ἀφ' οὗ παρ' ἐγὼ γινώσκω εἰς ἀνδρὶς ἡλικίαν. 4th line.

³ Upton's note upon ἐν ταῖς καὶ ἡμέραις. P. 170, Τρυφερά καὶ.

⁴ Henry Stephens' opinion, as far as I can judge from the following extract, which I found in Hudson's edition, is not decisive:

"Eos igitur, qui Dionysii opera critica et rhetorica ante Antiquitatum libros scripta fuisse contendunt, (quæ et mea est sententia) hisce argumentis niti oportet: uno, quod multa quæ in illis sunt reprehensiones quendam juvenilis ingenii favorem præ se ferunt: altero, quod si historiam prius scrips-

Dionysius not only does not quote any parallel passage from Virgil, but makes no allusion whatever to that poet; which seems to prove that he was then unacquainted with the Latin language, and consequently that this treatise was prior to the Antiquities. To this I answer, that his silence was in unison with the conduct of later authors; for Gibbon tells us, "There is not, I believe, from Dionysius to Libanius, a single Greek critic who mentions Virgil or Horace; they seem ignorant that the Romans had any good writers." That they, who called all other nations barbarians, neither loved their conquerors nor prized their literature, may safely be assumed; nor should it excite surprise if the Greeks had known, and yet declined to notice, the merits of Virgil and Horace.

In reading the parallels of Plutarch, we easily discern and pardon the national prejudice of the writer; and few will refuse to allow, that, while the painful consciousness of present humiliation was heightened by the bitter remembrance of past glory, the critics of Greece were unlikely to celebrate the poets of Italy. But with Dionysius the case was widely different, for he devoted a large portion of his life to the illustration of Roman antiquities; and as the *Georgics*² are said to have been finished the very year of his arrival, it is all but impossible that Virgil's fame should be unknown to our critic, and very improbable that he, who was paying his court at Rome, would have purposely neglected to notice the representative metre of that poet, if the Romans were familiar with its beauties, and deemed him in this, as in other respects, the rival of Homer. I, however, who have ventured to deny not only the notoriety, but the existence of representative metre in Homer and Virgil, cannot allow that Dionysius was bound to notice what the countrymen of Virgil overlooked; and shall leave the reader to decide the date of the treatise, while I attempt to invalidate its contents.

As Homer was copied, in a greater or less degree, by all succeeding poets, their practice should afford as clear a demonstration of this art as the criticisms of our author; and if we find corresponding instances in their works, the prevalence of this opinion among them ought not to be disputed. Dionysius says, that poets and historians concur in this practice; but as his quotations are taken from Homer alone, his assertion will not facilitate our inquiries. Upton, indeed, quotes two passages in Apollonius Rhodius, which seem analogous to

sisset, non verisimile quum Thucydidea quædam in eâ imitetur, ex his etiam quæ imitatus esset, nonnulla postea in ipso Thucydide reprehensurum. Neque tamen interim negaverim fieri et hoc posse, ut ex variis illis rhetoricis commentariis, aliquem aut etiam aliquos et post impositum historiæ finem scripserit."

¹ 2d chap. 1st vol. Decline and Fall.

² V. Virgilii vitam per annos digestam, U. C. 724.

Προπροκυλινδόμενος πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,

and are as follows :

ἐπὶ δ' ἐρρώσαντο πόδεςσιν
Προπροβιαζόμενοι· ἥ δ' ἔσπετο Πηλιάς Ἀργῶ.

Argon. lib. i. v. 385.

and

Ἡ δ' ἄφαρ, ὥστε κύλινδρος, ἐπέτρεχε κύματι λαύρῳ
Προπροκαταίγδην κολίης ἀλός.

Lib. ii. v. 596.

But he adds, "nullus tamen excitatur affectus," an opinion in which, I believe, all will agree, as the trifling similarity of sound cannot so countervail the striking difference of meaning, as to make the three passages productive of one effect, and referrible to one cause.

The Grecian authors, taken collectively, will doubtless furnish many instances, in which a faint, or perhaps a strong, resemblance may be discoverable; but this will hardly be sufficient, for, as the imitation of Homer is evident and undeniable in other cases, so are we entitled to expect, that the adaptation of the sound to the sense shall be clearly visible; and that the nicety and artifice of that adaptation shall evince the skill as well as the intention of the artist. In short, there must be here, as in other imitations of Homer, not only the use, but the abuse of art; success and failure, propriety and impropriety, moderation and extravagance, must be found in all their various forms before it can be justly asserted, that the practice of Greece was in harmony with the declarations of Dionysius.

The tragedians' and lyrists enjoyed a license which was denied to the epic poet. Let us seek, therefore, in their pages for the necessary proofs, and if our search is unsuccessful, let us not conclude that they were unable to bend the bow of Homer, but rather that our critic was not warranted in his assertions. We learn, also, from a note of Twining, that Homer was the great and inexhaustible resource of the parodists; let us, then, enquire whether there is any reason for believing that they availed themselves of means, the agency of which is said to be so powerful, and which are certainly capable of general application. If our search is again fruitless, let us turn to the Latin authors, and examine the practice of Virgil, and the opinions of his countrymen. K.

¹ I believe no one attributes the repetition of σ in
"Ἔσωσά σ', ὡς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὄσοι

to a "consulta verborum κακοφωνία."

Κακοφωνία, according to the Scholiast on Hephaestion, (p. 184.) by no means implies harshness.

Κακόφωνος δέ ἐστιν ὃ πολλά φωνήεντα πρίσσειν· οἶον,
Φῆγ' ἀτρηλοισιγόν ἔχειν· ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὤμῳ. (Od. λ. 127.)

The "Non, il n'est rien que Ninine n'honore" of Voltaire is well known. See *Class. Journ.* Vol. ix. p. 589.

D. HEINSII ORATIO
DE UTILITATE, QUÆ E LECTIONE TRAGÆDIARUM
PERCIPITUR.

IN our 17th No. p. 9. we, by the advice of a friendly correspondent, republished "*Boxhornii Oratio de Constitutione Tragædiarum, et Sapientia civili, atque Eloquentia ex earum Lectione haurienda;*" and by the advice of the same writer, we present to our readers an Oration of D. Heinsius, taken from "*D. Heinsii Orationum Editio nova,*" published at Amsterdam, 1657. 12mo.

Oratio de Utilitate, quæ à Lectione Tragædiarum percipitur, Habita, cum Electrem Sophoclis interpretaturus esset

GORGIAS ille Leontinus, Auditores, cui vires suas et rotunditatem quandam in dicendo antiqui oratores se debere fatentur, Tragædiam definiebat, *Fallaciam, quæ qui deciperet, justior eo qui non deciperet, qui deciperetur, sapientior eo qui non deciperetur, esset.* Videtis breve illud et argutum, quo tantopere delectabatur, disserendi genus. Oraculum autem verius, nec ille, nec Apollo Delphicus, pronuntiavit unquam. Nam cum aspera minusque amœna sit virtutis via, qui inusitata quadam ac insolita docendi ratione et apparatu, ita flectere, et quasi incantare, humanos possunt animos, ut inviti, et cum voluptate tamen quadam, sapientiam sequantur, quemadmodum prudenter, ita juste infelicitati humanæ imponunt, neque minus necessaria quam salutare quadam fraude utuntur. Ceterum à tantis viris posse decipi, paucorum est: et illorum fore tantum, qui præstantiam eorum, si non assequi re ipsa, mente ac intellectu æstimare ac complecti possunt, qui cum aliquo judicio decipiuntur. Profecto equidem, quoties theatri veteris ornatum, quoties stupendam illam opulentiam ac apparatus, illos modos, gestus, cantus et saltationes, quæ extrinsecus adhibebantur, (quæ spectaculorum instrumenta Aristoteles præclare dixit) recte considero; veneticum quoddam et doctissimas præstigiis fuisse Tragædiam judico: quibus multo efficacius quam legibus Solonis sui, ad representationes Tragicas pertraherentur isti. Contra autem ipsum Sophoclem in manus quotidie cum summo, cum severam illam, gravem, sobriam, prudentem, castigatam, splendidam, semperque sui similem orationis formam, vere Atticam, sententiarum autem vel imprimis densitatem æstimare incipio ac pondus; non tam hominem profecto, quam cælestem aliquem virtutis genium, audire videor: qui inferiora hæc, in quibus volutemur, nunquam pede, his sordibus contaminatus, presserit, sed in alto aliquo et publico theatro, vitæ nostræ clades ac calamitates observavit ac despexit. ibi natus, ibi educatus, uni huic rei semper fuerit intentus. Cujus spectatores, non Athenienses, sed humanum genus esse oporteat: quique linguæ suæ gnaros, Occidentem pariter atque Orientem habuisse mereatur. Neque enim, quæ ad uni-

versam vitam, quæ ad universos spectant homines, quæque tam divina ac severa gravitate, castitate ac prudentia, de omnibus dicuntur, tam angustis contineri debuissent finibus existimo. quæ ut penitus examinari, neque nostri nunc est otii neque instituti, ut qui linguæ venustatem, mores ac antiquitates explicandas obiter atque illustrandas nunc suscepimus, ita nefas duco, in minutis sic hære, ut ad illa quæ majora sunt, neque animum nec oculos subinde attollamus. Nam ut magnam ac præstantem regiam, plures si videant, ut singuli sententiam de ea ferant, tabulas in ea pictor, muros, lacunaria, ac topiaria, peritus horum æstimabit, cætera geometra, qui de proportionibus judicare solent, melius videbunt: ita cum in Sophocle, Grammaticus, Poëta, ac Rhetor, singuli virtutes suas invenerint, plus Philosophis relinquunt. Non de Dialecticis jam loquor: qui acute disputare quam prudenter malunt vivere. Neque Physicos intelligo: impii eos qui in aëre, in terræ superficie aut penetralibus cum vivant, domi et in terris peregrini sunt, non cives. Sed de parte hac, quæ reliquarum imperatrix dicitur ab Aristotele, quæ et singulos, ut homines, et omnes, tanquam cives, quid sit sui muneris in urbe, docet, et quod longe est præcipuum, sortem ac conditionem hominum vere ac concinne ob oculos lectori ponit. Quid est homo? umbræ somnium, si quæras, respondebit Pindarus. Quid est homo? simulacrum quoddam, dicit Sophocles. Quid est homo? ipsa calamitas, ut loquitur Herodotus. Quid est homo? occasio miseriarum, ut Philemon loquitur. Quid est homo? folium caducum, ut Homerus loquitur. Quid est homo? exemplum imbecillitatis, temporis spoliū, lusus fortunæ, mutationis imago, invidiæ et calamitatis trutina: præter illa, nihil, nisi pituitæ aliquantulum et bilis, dicit, et jam olim dixit Aristoteles. Hoc sive animal, seu monstrum potius, cujus orbis quantus quantus est ambitionem ac lucri stadium non capit, fletu spectatorem in lucem editus salutat, neque oratione, sed lacrymis ac fletu primas partes agit, quam in spem ac felicitatem à natura porro educatur. Prologum videtis: mutum hercules omnino, nisi quatenus vagire solet, unde et infantem haud immerito Latini, *νηπιον* dixerunt Græci. Donec tandem fari sensim, et interpretatione linguæ, miseram conditionem suam, nondum quidem explicare (nam quis satis eam novit? sed fateri tamen incipit. Ita ad magistros ablegatur, quorum fetulis ac virgis patientiam indulget: sæpe truculentis, sæpe barbaris. nam et hic Ajaces sunt qui flagra gestant, non in scena tantum. Interim rem agi credas. Literarum nexus atque syllabarum, mox verborum, discunt. Addo et, ut magno postea labore disciplinas discant, prius cum majore in linguis diu versantur, atque hic sane Protasis, quæ prima pars Tragædiæ, ponatur. Sequitur secunda, plane ut in Tragædia videmus: in qua turbæ aliæ ex aliis nascuntur. Plerique enim, simul atque ad pubertatem est devenit, quasi non virorum sit ubique satis quibus otium ac libertatem suam mancipare possint, inservire feminis incipiunt: quæ his moribus ac corruptela, ab ætatis anno decimo et quarto, domus vocantur. plane id quod sunt, ac optimo cum jure; non impiorum modo, sed procaces quoque nostro vitio ac insolentes. Ibi jam desidiöse ætas agitur ac misere. Obsidendæ fores, salutandi multi, plures me-

tuendi: ancillarum quoque nutus ac servorum, diligenter observandi
 iis qui ad dominas affectant viam. Adde, quod plerunque quæ amari
 nostro vitio se didicit ac intellexit, non minores à calamitate nostra,
 quam ab opibus aut forma sua spiritus assumit.

*At lachrymans exclusus amator, limina sæpe
 Floribus et sertis operit: postisque superhos
 Ungit amaracino, et foribus miser oscula figit.*

quodque magis admireris, ex his vere Comicis, ineptiis miseriisque,
 optima Tragœdiarum nascuntur argumenta. Defunctos isto malo,
 domi malum sæpe gravius, foris innumera excipiunt. Quippe hic mi-
 litis, iste mercatoris, alius agricolæ, alius causicidici personam agit.
 quisque ita suam, ut felicem alienam existimet: fastidiosi histriones,
 et cum aliis molesti, tum sibi. Porro si quis altiora struit, et ambi-
 tioni pedem laxat, inter spes et vota rem cum cura gerit: id est, vigi-
 lando somniat. vel dum non consequitur quæ optat, vel quod conse-
 cutus magna, ideo majora jam sperare audet. Ille filii obitum deplor-
 rat: iste, sed cum lachrymis, moleste optat. Huic domi est Medea,
 non ad horam, ut in scena, sed ad vitam comes. Illum fortuna nun-
 quam melior respexit: illum diu, sed hac lege, ut subito relinquat;
 interdum et ludibrio exponat. nam cum aliqui se semper miseros
 fuisse clament, longe tamen est miserrimus qui semper felix fuit.
 Hinc suspitia, hinc lachrymæ, hinc luctus, hinc Tragœdiæ infelix illud
 condimentum, heu heu! quod in vita paginam utramque facit. Jam
 si ad Ajaces nostros et Œdipodas eamus; propria eorum ut in scena,
 ita et in vita est calamitas. qui quot satellitibus, tot curis, tot molestiis
 stipantur, neque cadunt ut resurgant, sed ut semper jaceant ac depri-
 mantur. Sicut enim minima animalcula è loco vel altissimo, impune
 cadunt, majora casus quilibet comminuit et frangit: ita sceptræ ac
 fasces, opes ac potentiæ, et inania ista rerum, ut stantibus dignitatem
 addunt, ita lapsos pondere ipso premunt et comminuant. Partem ul-
 timam, ut in Tragœdia, ita raro invenias in vita. Quotusquisque enim
 senectutem attingit? quæ et hic Catastrophe vocari meretur. ultima
 quippe ætas, officina luctus, portus vitæ simul et calamitatum mare
 est. quam ut omnes optant, ita nemo consecutus, ea gaudet: optima
 cum expectatur, cum advenit, onerosa sibi, aliis molesta. Instat enim
 diu viventibus natura. quæ, ut creditor immitis, aut danista importu-
 nus, jus suum sibi flagitat. Itaque, si nimium cuncteris, huic oculum,
 illi dentem, illi sensum aliquem, aut omnes simul, tanquam pignus,
 eripit ac tollit. ut qui modo omnia excelsa spirat, jam imago sui aut
 cadaver vivum inter homines oberret. Quanquam fabulam ut plurimum
 mors ipsa, rerum linea ac finis ultimus, absolvit: cujus machinæ, ut
 olim histriones loquebantur, plurimæ. Quosdam enim ferrum, quos-
 dam mare, alios libido propria absunit: plerosque nihil tale cogitan-
 tes, quasi è postscenio, invadit, ut non vitam modo, sed et spes in me-
 dio abruptat. Plenam suis partibus Tragœdiam habetis: cujus Deus
 est choragus; argumentum, luctus ac calamitas; histriones, miseri
 mortales; chorus, feminae et viri; apparatus, aurum et argentum,
 vestes variae et magno precio conductæ: aliena omnia ac mutuata,

sæpe autem subito reddenda. Theatrum est hic orbis, in quo hominem natura collocavit. qui, si nos respicias, diffusus; si hanc terram, quaqua panditur, angustus; si immensum illud cælum, quod hanc ambit undique et involvit, puncti instar est. quem cum magnus Alexander integrum vicisset, paulo post sex pedes occupavit. Reliqua discordiis ac ferro hæredes divisere. cum ex iis nemo esset, qui tam amplum possidere patrimonium ex asse posset. quod si aliquis despiceret è cælo, forte quæreret, nec inveniret. Ite nunc, ô histriones nostri, ite, et personam suam quisque agat, ut videtur. Tu qui purpuram et sceptrum geris, quem cum multi cingant, plures timent, nemo non extinctum vellet, orbem animo invade: spes tuas et insaniam votorum, quantum lubet ac videtur, erige aut extende: aliquid humana sorte majus concipe animo ac volve: hostem magno animo invade: militem conscribe: aciem dispone: montes maximos complana: latifundia et turres præstina ac cole. sed, ô noster, finis instat, et jam vela scenæ complicantur. Tu, cui opes contigerunt, speciosum illud, si videtur, lutum, quod choragi munere ad tempus accepisti, oculis et mente, quantum potes, contemplare: hujus gratia, dum vivis, curre, rape, suda, ara, naviga, ac vigila: causas in judicio ac foro, quantum voce vales et lateribus, declama: orbos ac pupillos circumscribe, vi-
duas emunge: huic denique inservi, et divinam animæ cælestis partem, ipsam, inquam, rationem, rei quæ nec sentit nec intelligit, submitte, huic penitus inhære. aut, ne tange quidem, si hoc placet: (et quis multis hoc placere neget?) sed in terra alibi depone, secuturus ipse. Finis quippe instat fabulæ, quam agis: et jam ornamenta flagitat qui dedit. Dedit, dico? imo mutuavit. Brevem, ut novistis, ambitum Tragædiæ, ac strictum, Rex philosophorum ponit. noster, si æternitatem spectes, nullus dici potest. nullum enim spatium aut intervallum habet. omnia momento hic geruntur. Quod infantiam ac senectutem vulgo vocant, et hoc ipsum quo hæc dividuntur spatium, aut potius momentum, anni Platonici vix hora est. Ex quo ipso somnus, tanquam publicanus quidam, maximum vectigal sibi petit; mortis fidejussor quidam, et quasi autembulo. qui quotidie nos docet id, quod aliquando semper est futurum. Hæc inculcant Tragici, hæc monent: hæc exemplis, hæc sententiis confirmant. Hæc in Academia eadem tempestate Socrates, qua in theatro publice Euripides, docebat. sed sublimius utroque Sophocles, plerumque et efficacius. ut qui in Republica personam egit, dux Atheniensium et prætor. Vere ubique magnus: domi imperator pariter et foris. Hæc doctrina primum animis cum cura infigenda est: reliqua deinde et secundo loco. Quod in posterum facturi sumus. Multum enim didicit, qui sortem suam ac conditionem intellexit, qui personam bene, et ut brevi aliud acturus, hic sustinuit: qui ex decoro genuit ac luxit. nisi quod hic vero gemitu ac ejulatu opus est. Nam ut omnium Philosophorum scripta evolvatis, neminem prudentius scripsisse judicabitis quam Heraclitus flevit.

IN CARMINA EPODICA ÆSCHYLEA
COMMENTARIUS.
AUCTORE G. B.

No. II. [Vid. No. XXII. p. 242.]

PERGO ad Agamemnona, nobilem illam tragædiam, et simul tot et tantis mendis depravatam, ut Viri Doctissimi vix decem versus continguos intelligere queant. Minime igitur mirari debet lector, si quis, metra et sententiam propiciens, paulo liberius se gerat, in vulgata scriptura pro libitu mutanda. Nonnunquam tamen illa audacia non modo non veniam sibi poscit, sed potius laudem arrogat, dum locis plane desperatis remedium affert. Exemplum habe ex Epodo ad fabulæ initium. Sic enim lego v. 110 et sqq.

Τῖσον περ εἴρων Εὐκλία
δρόσοις ἀεπτυστιν λεόντων
μαλερῶν πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις
θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοις, στρουθὺν λύτερον ἀπαιτεῖ
ξύμβολα κράναι ὕξια
μὲν, κατάμυμφα εἰς φάσματ', Ἴ-
ήϊ, ἀνακαλ-
ῶ σέ, Παίαν,
μή τις ἀντιπνούς Δανα-
οῖς χρονίας ἐχέτηδ' αἰ-
ἀπλοῖα;
τεύξει τις,
σπενδόμενος θυρίαν ἀνέστην ἄ-
δαιτον, νεικέων τέκτον', ἀσύγχυτον
οὐδ' εὐήνερα μίμνει γάρ φεβερά παλίνορσον
εἰκόνομος δολία μνάμων μῆνις τεκνύποιος·
τοιαύτ' Κάλχας ἐνὶ μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀπέκλαγξεν
μόρσιμ', ἀπ' ὀρνίθων ὕσιον, οἴκοις βασιλείεσσιν.

V. 1. Ald. ἄφρων καλὰ. Victor. εὐφρων ἀ καλὰ: ubi mendam alteram sustulit, alteram prætermisit. Dedi Εὐκλία. Sarpe etenim permutantur α et ι. In Troas. 977. Ald. εὐθύνας. MSS. Ἀθήνας. In Choeph. 303. Ald. εὐδόξω Rob. ἀδόξω. Dianæ nomen Εὐκλία servatur a Schol. in Soph. Œd. T. 161. probante Elmsleio, et, post Brunckium, allegante Plutarch. Aristid. p. 331. E. unde corrigunt VV. DD. gl. Hesychii Εὐλακία, Ἀρτιμῖς. V. 4. Vulgo ὀβρικάλοισι τρεπνὰ τούτων: mox post φάσματα sequebatur στρουθὺν: e qua voce in sedem propriam reposita patet τούτων nasci e corrupta gl. αἰτών: etenim Scholiastes habet Στρουθὺν, αἰτών. Deinde e τρεπνὰ crui λύτερον απ. Nempe Diana ab aquilis (i. e. Atridis) pœnam reposcit. Vox λύτερον in λύγρον corrumpi-

tur in Choeph. 46. ut monuit Canterus; qui rectius legere poterat
 Τι γὰρ πιστότος λύτερον αἵματος πίδαμ. V. 5. Post δεῖμα μὲν subaudi ἡμῖν et
 τοῖς ἰγθροῖς post κατόμαμφα. V. 7. Ex ἱερὸν δὲ καλῶ παιῖνα erui ἴη ἀνα-
 καλῶ σε παιῖν. Cf. CEd. T. 15k. ἴη δὲ παιῖν. Perpetuum est ver-
 bum ἀνακαλῶ precor. Vid. Indic. Beck. V. 12. Redde τιῦν faciat :
 mox τις excidit ob σπ. Et sane in sententiis ambiguis optime locum
 habet illud τις : cf. supr. τινος : et Iph. T. 522. 548. Ion. 1311. Antig.
 762. Aj. 1123. S. C. Th. 108. De τις corrupto vel omisso vide
 Porson Hec. 1169. V. 13. Ita Ald. pro σπειδομαι. Mox vulgo θυ-
 σαν ἱέραν ανομοις τιν' ἀδαίτον : unde erui θυσίαν ἀνίορτον ἀδαίτον. gl. est
 ἀνομοι. Exstat ἀνίορτος in Eurip. Electr. 310. ubi MS. ἀνίορτος. Simi-
 lis fere error hic peperit ἱέραν. V. 14. Vulgo τίκτονα σύμφυτον. Hæc
 nemo intellexit, neque intelligere potuit. Ex Hesychio hausi ἀσύγχυ-
 τος, quod exponit Lexicon αἰμικτὸν ἢ γονὶ μὴ συγχιρνώμενον. Nempe ludit
 Æschylus in voce ἀσύγχυτος : quæ de vino dicta sonat non miscenda,
 de inimicitia vero non placanda : eandem scilicet metaphoram usur-
 pant Græci in phrasi ἀσπίστος vel ἀσπονδὸς ἰγθρα. De qua locutione
 adis loca congesta Schæfero ad Dionys. de Composit. Verb. p. 38. et
 Lobeck ad Soph. Aj. 891. qui legendo in Agam. 1214. ἀσπονδὸν τ' Ἄρη-
 ν φίλοις πῦρσιν conjecturam Butlero præripuit, et mihi locum satis ap-
 partu indicavit, quo mea quoque emendatio defendi possit : ibi enim
 Clytemnestra dicitur πνῦσαι ἀσπονδὸν Ἄρην φίλοις, hic vero Iphigeniæ
 nuptis dicitur esse futura origo νεκρίαν ἀσυγχύτων i. e. ἀσπόδων. Potuit
 quoque Æschylus, usurpata voce ἀσύγχυτος, respicere ad metaphoram,
 quam in v. infr. 322. adhibuit de oleo et aceto non facile miscendis.
 Οἶκαί βουα αἰμικτὸν ἐν πέλει πρέπειν Ὀξος τ' ἀλειψά τ' ἰγχιᾶς ταύτῳ κύτι
 Διχαστατόδ' τ' ἀν οὐ φίλους προσπνέπει. V. 15. Alii οὐδ' εἰσηύρα, vero
 proxime. Reposui οὐδ' εἰσερα. Noster enim de sacrificio locutus ad
 Homericum φίλος : οὐκ respiciebat : ita tamen vocis etymologiam,
 scilicet εὖ bene et ἀντὶ maritus, in animo habebat, ut oraculi sensum
 ambiguum servaret.

Ibid. 177. et seq.

Πυρρὸς δ' ὑπ' εὐαγγέλιου
 πόλιν εἰσέχει διὰ
 βράχης· εἰ δ' ἐτήτυμον, τίς
 οἶσεν, ἥ τι φησὶς ἐστ'· ἥ
 κακὸν βεῖν τίς ὄψεταί νύξ;
 ἥ φρενῶν κεκλιμένους, φλογ-
 ῶς παραγγελιατι. νέ-
 ος περὶ βέντα καρδί-
 αι ἐστ'·
 ἀλλαγῇ

λογου καμῖν ;
 γυναικὸς ἀχν-
 ῇ πρέπει πρὸς τοῦ φανέν-
 1 ος χάριν ξυμπίσει
 πειθαγὸς ἀγχι
 ἐπιέμεται
 ὁ βέλους ἄγχι;
 ταχύπτερος, ἀλλ' ἂν
 ταχύμυρον γυναικοκέρ-
 10 οκτον ὀλλυται κλ' ὅς.

V. 6. Vice κεκλιμένος reposui κεκλιμένος. Eadem vox restituenda
 est Theognidi v. 223. Κεῖνος γ' ἄφρων ἵστί τόν κεκλιμένον ἰσθλοῦ. vulgo
 βεβλαμμένος. V. 8. περὶ βέντα est conjectura probabilis Blomfieldi in
 Edinb. Rev. Nō. 38. p. 498. qui tamen lectionem suam exemplis
 non munivit. At conferre poterat Orest. 874. ἄγγιλμ' ἀνπτίρσιν—

Suppl. 89. φόβος μ' ἀνιπτιροῖ. Antig. 1307. ἀνίπταν φόβῳ. Aristoph. Av. 1453. Ἀνιπτιρώσθαι καὶ πιπυτῆσθαι τὰς φρίδας. At longe aptissimus esset Agam. 1531. Ἀμυχανῶ φροτίδων στικηβίς modo probata fuisset conjectura Wakefieldi legentis πτιρωβίς in Silv. Crit. I. s. xlv. p. 47. ubi plura in hanc rem reperiet lector studiosus. V. 12. Vice αἰχμῇ reposui ἀχμῆ: qua voce significatur quicquid est ponderis nullius nempe *palea, spuma maris, fumus, scintilla, lini flos* (Anglice *flew vel stuff.*) Hic vero de mulierum levitate potest intelligi. V. 17. Ὁρος non satis capio. Restitui ὄρος. Hesych. Ὀροι — μῦθοι, λόγοι.

Accedo ad tres Epodicos cantus, quam maxime depravatos. Burneus quidem in Tentamine de Metris Æschyleis eos inter systemata Antispastica recenset. At, ni fallor, a vero aberravit, dum metri causa unumquodque systema post singulam Stropham et singulam Antistropham iteratum esse voluit. Alia mihi carminis esse ratio videtur. Quod quum nemo intellexerit, neque potuerit intelligere nisi versibus trajectis et verbis aliquantisper mutatis, totum cantum ad meam mentem emendatum exscribere libet.

Ibid. 1457. &c.

XO. Ἰὼ ἰὼ

παρὰ νόμους

Ἑλένα μία τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς

ψυχὰς ὀλέσας ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ

Πρωωδός.

στροφῇ α'.

ἀντιστρ. α'.

HMIX. α'. φεῦ τίς ἂν ἐν τάχει

μὴ περιώδυνος

μηδὲ δειμνιοτή-

ρης μόλοι τὸν αἰὲ φέρουσ' ἡμῖν

μοῖρ' ἀτέλεστον ὕπνον, δαμνεν-

ος φύλακος εὐμενεστάτου

καὶ πολλὰ τλάντος γυναικὸς διὰ,

πρὸς γυναικὸς δ' ἀπέφθισεν.

K.1. μηδὲν θανάτου μοῖραν ἐπεύχου,

τοῖσδε βαρυνθεῖς

μὴδ' εἰς Ἑλένην κότον ἐκτρέψης,

ὡς ἀνδρολέτειρ' ὡς μία πολλῶν

Τρῶων ψυχὰς Δαναῶν τ' ὀλέσας

ἀρκύστατον ἄλγος ἐπραξε.

HMIX. β'. δαῖμον, δς ἐμπίτνεις δώ-

μασι καὶ διφυ-

εῖσι Τανταλίδαισ-

ιν, κράτος γυναικῶν ἰσόψυχον

καρδιοδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύν-

οις ἐπὶ δὲ σῶμά τις, δίκαν

τοῦ κόρακος, ἐχθρὸν σταθεῖς ἐκνό-

μως

ὕμνον ὕμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται.

K.1. νῦν δ' ὀρθώσας στόματος

γλῶσσαν,

τὸν περίλιχνον

δαίμονα γενναῖς τῆσδε κικλήσκειν.

ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἀγᾶς αἱματόλειχος

μοῖρ' ἐκτρέφεται πρὶν κατέληξεν

τὸ καλαιὸν ἄχρος, νεὸς ἰχώρ.

XO. νῦν δὲ τελεῖα πολύμν-

αστος ἀπηνθισε δι' αἶμ'

ἀνιπτον, ἥτις ἦν

τότ' ἐν δόμοις, ἔρις,

ἔρις αἰδάματος

ἀρνος, οἰζύς.

ἐπαφδός α'.

στρ. β'.
 ΗΜΙΧ. α'. Ἡ μέγαν οἴκοις τοῖσδε
 δαίμονα καὶ βαρύμηνιν αἰ-
 νεῖς, Φεῦ, Φεῦ, κακὸν αἶνον ἀτη-
 ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστου· 40
 ἰῶ ἰῶ δῦαι Διὸς
 παναιτίου πανεργέτα·
 τί δὲ βροτοῖς ἀνευ
 Διὸς τελεῖται; τί τῶνδ'
 οὐ θεόκραντὸν ἔστιν; 45
 ΚΑ. αὖχαι τ' εἶναι τόδε τούργον
 ἔμῳν,
 μήτ' ἐπιλέχθης
 Ἀγαμεμνονίαν κτείνειν σφ' ἄλρχον·
 φανταζόμενος δὲ γυναικὶ νεκροῦ
 τοῦδ' ὁ παλκιδὸς δριμύς ἀλάστῳ 50
 Ἀτρεΰς χαλεποῦ θοινατῆρος
 τῶνδ' ἀπέτισεν,
 τέλεόν γ' ἄρ' ὥς ἐπιθύσας.

ΧΘ. βασιλεῦ βασιλέων πῶς σε δακρύσω ἐπι
 φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας; τί ποτ' εἶπω σοι;
 κείσαι ὃ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ',
 οὐδ' ἄμ' ἐλευθέρου οἶμοι θανάτου,
 βίον ἐκπνέων 75
 ἀσεβεῖ πότμῳ,
 οἶμοι κοιτᾶν
 τᾶνδ' ἀνελευθερῶν,
 μιαρῶ δολίῳ θαμείς ἐκ
 χερός ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνῳ. 80

στροφή γ'.
 ΗΜΙΧ. α'. ἀμηχανῶ, φροντίζων
 . στερεθῆεις,
 ἀπάλαμος μεριμνᾶν, ὅπα τράπω-
 μαι, πίπτοντος οἴκου· δέδοικα δ' ὄμβρ-
 ου κτύπον
 δημοσφαλῇ τὸν αἵμα- 85
 τηρόν· ψεκᾶς κέκληγε.
 δίκην δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα
 θήγει βλάβης πρὸς ἄλλαις
 θηγάναισι μοῖρα.
 ΧΘ. ὦ γὰρ, εἴθ' ἔμ' ἐδέξω, πρὶν
 ἰδεῖν 90
 ἀσχυροτόιχου δροίτας

ἀντιστρ. β'.
 ΗΜΙΧ. β'. ὥς μὲν ἀναίτιος ἦσθα
 τοῦδε φόνου, τίς ὁ μαστυρή- 55
 σων; πῶς τῶν πατρώθεν γε συλλήπ-
 τῳ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀλάστῳ;
 λιάζεται δ' ὁμοσπόροις
 ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων
 μέλας Ἀρης· ὁ παῖς 60
 σὲ γὰρ, προβαίνων λάχνα,
 κηρὶ βορᾶν παρέξει·
 ΚΑ. ὦδε γὰρ οὗτος δολίαν ἄτην
 οἴκοισιν ἔθηκ'·
 ἀλλ', ἔμῳν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔρνος ἀερθὲν, 65
 τὴν πολύκλαυτον ἀνάξια δράσας
 ἄξια πάσχων, μηδ' ἄμ' ἐν Ἀἰδοῦ
 μεγαλαυχεῖτω· ξιφοδηλῆτω
 τῷδε γενεσθῶ
 θανάτῳ τίσαι, τάπερ ἔρξεν. 70

ἀντιστρ. γ'.
 ΗΜΙΧ. β'. ὄνειδος ἦκει τόδ' ἀντ'
 ὄνειδους·
 δύσμαχα δ' ἐστὶ κρῖναι "φθερῆ
 φθερόν", 100
 ἐκτίνει δ' ὁ καίνων." μένει θέμις
 δόντος ἐν
 χρόνῳ Διὸς παθεῖν τὸν
 ἐρξαντα· θέσμιον γὰρ
 τίς ἂν γονὰν ῥᾶον δομ- 105
 ων ἐκβάλοι; κεκόλλη-
 ται γένος πρὸς ὕψος.
 ΚΑ. οὐ σε προσήκει τὸ μέλημα
 λέγειν
 τοῦτο· πρὸς ἡμῶν καΐππεσε

τὸν κατέχοντα χαμεύναν.

τίς ὁ βάψων νιν; τίς ὁ θρηνήσων;

ἢ σὺ τόδ' ἔξαιτλήσει κτείνας'

ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς,

95

ἀποκώκυσαι ψυχὴν, ἄχασιν

χάριν ἄντ' ἔργων

μεγάλων ἀδίκως ἐπικραῖναι;

κάτθανε καὶ καταθάψομεν 110

οὐχ ὑπὸ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἴκων,

ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀσπασίως

θυγάττη, ὡς χεῖρ,

πατέρ' ἀντίασασα πρὸς ἀκύπορον

πόσθμευμ' ἀχέων

περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα φιλήσει.

XO. πᾶς ὃ ἐπιτύμβιον

ἐπεὶ δὲ γ'

αἶνον ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ θεί-

ῳ ξὺν ὀακροῖσι-

ἄλλων ἐν ἀληθεί-

120

ᾳ φρενῶν ἱρῇ-

νον ποιήσει.

V. 3. Vulgo μία τὰς πολλὰς τὰς πέντε πολλὰς. Voces repetitas rejeci. V. 7. ἐν ἡμῖν. Burneijs delet ἱ. V. 8. ἀτίλειτον analogiæ oppugnat. Emendavi ἀτίλειτον in Append. Troad. p. 135. A. V. 11. βιον delendum jussit Hermannus. Φθίω est verbum intransitivum. In Soph. Trach. 1043. corrige ἵνασον ἀκυπίτι μόρῃ τὸν μίλειον φθάσας. vice φθίσας. V. 16. Vice ἀνδρῶν quod abundat post ἀνδρολίτιον reposui Τρώων. Cf. Virgil. Aen. ii. 573. Troje et patriæ communis Erinnyes. Scil. Helena. Cf. et Eurip. Helen. 389. τὸ δ' ἐμὲν δίμας ὤλεσε Δαρδάνι' ἐλομένης ἑ' Ἀχαιοῦς. V. 17. Vulgo ἀξύστατον. quod nemo intellexit. Dedi ἀρκύστατον: cf. supr. 1377. πημόνη ἀρκύστατον. V. 22. Non bene Græcum ἐπὶ σώματος—σταθίς. Legi potuit ἀπὸ: Vid. Musgrav. ad Troad. 527. Sed lingua postulat nominativum; neque suum τις, recte dictum, Æschylus rejiciet. V. 25. Vulgo γινώμην. De permutatis γινώμην et γλώσταν, vide Munklandum et Porsonum ad Eurip. Suppl. 547. V. 26. Vulgo τὸν τριπύχων. Scriptura manifeste prava est Reposui περιλιχίον. Cognatam vocem ὑπολιχίς agnoscit H. anus: de qua plura præbet Porsonus ad Hippol. 917. V. 27. ὠρεθῶσαι—κικλήσκων. Verba nescio quis mutavit ignarus scilicet constructionis probatæ, quæ nominativus cum infinitivo, pro imperativo, conjungi solet. Vid. Keen ad Gregor. p. 198. Elmsleium Edinburgh Rev. No. 34. Feb. 1811. p. 493. V. 28. Ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔργου αἱματολοιχὸς Νίξιν τρεῖται πρὶν καταλῆσαι. Hæc maxime depravata alii aliter corrigere sunt conati. Αἱματολοιχὸς debetur Stanleio, qui citat v. supr. 837. Ἀδὲν ἐλίσιν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ. De μοῖσιν ad *versus initium eliso vide Porson. ad Phœn. 1622. Loco ibi citato adde fragmentum Incerti apud Stob. R. N. p. 12. Gesn. et Soph. CEd. C. 1219. ut alibi fortasse ostendam. 1546. et V. 32. ἀπηνίσι Stanleius, vice ἀπηνίσι. V. 35. Vulgo ἔρις ἰεῖδματος ἀνδρός. Literas εἰ male omissas supplevi et ε δματος effinxi ἀδάματος: mox ἀριος pro ἀνδρός. Idem erratum correxit Piersonus ad Mær. p. 273. et ipse in Append. Troad. p. 160. De fraude ovīs aureo vellere et malis inde in Atridas illatis perlegas omnino Eurip. Orest. 989 et sqq. V. 41. Vulgo διαί. Ipse διαί vocem Æschyleam reposui. Vid. Blomfield. ad Prom. 186. in

Glossario. qui tamen in v. 534. non bene tuetur Διουμὸς αἰκνῆς καὶ δῖας ἐκφυγγάνω: cum exhibeat Robortellus scripturam vero proximam καὶ βίας: lege καὶ βίας i. e. καὶ ἐκ: even in spite of Jove: de phrasi ἐκ βίας cf. Philoct. 563, 945. et 985. in quibus omnibus ἐκ βίας idem sonant atque βίᾳ; et sæpe dicitur βία τινὸς aliquo invito. V. 46. Vulgo αὐχίς. Reposui αὐχί τ'. ut in sententiâ copulis junctâ particula negativa, quam posterius membrum exhibet, in priori quoque subaudiretur. Cf. Troad. 485. et Aristoph. Av. 694. a Musgravio citatum. V. 48. Vice ἴσαι manifesto legendum κτῖναι. V. 53. Ε τίλιον νεροῖς erui τίλιον γ' ἄρ' ὧς: ad historiam supra dictam de οὐκ respicit Clytæmnestra. V. 55. Vulgo ἰ syllaba deficiente. Atticum ἦσθα sæpe librarii corrumpunt. In v. supr. 520. "Αλῖς παρὰ Σκάμανδρον ἡλθῖς ἀνάρσιος nescio quis in *Quarterly Rev.* No. VI. p. 393. restituit ἦσθ': et sic legitur In marg. Ask. teste Butlargo. Adi quoque Lobeckum ad Soph. Aj. 611. V. 56. πῶ, πῶ. in marg. Ask. exstat πῶς, πῶς. Dedi πῶς τῶν. V. 58. Vice βιάζονται reposui λιάζεται. Hesych. Λιάζει, ταράσσει. Cf. supr. 1436. ὥσπερ ἐν Φονολίβῳ γ' ἀχνα φρὴν ἐπιμαίνονται. sic enim lego vice οὖν—τύχα. V. 60. Vulgo ὅποι δι καί—πάχνα κουροβέρω. Ipse dedi ἰ παῖς σε γὰρ—λάχνα κηρὶ βοράν. Quam facile mutantur σ et δ patet e notis Marklandi ad Iph. A. 140. quod ad καί et γὰρ vid. Porson ad Phœn. 1495. Mox βάλιν λάχνα redde provector habendus propter barbaram crederetur. Deinde κηρὶ βοράν exponit ipse Æschylus in Eumen. 302. Ἄνα βόσκημα δαιμόνων, σκία necnon Suppl. 628. βόσκημα πημόνης. V. 66. Ἰφίγνῆϊαν expuli. V. 69. Hæc basis Anapæstica olim sedem habuit ante οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος. V. 70. Vulgo τίσας ἄπερ ἤρξιν. At non sibi invicem opponuntur τίσαι et ἄρξαι verum τίνιν et ἱρδῖν. Cf. infr. 103. παθῖν ἱρξάντα et quæ Stanleius ibi attulit. V. 72. Deest syllaba. Supplevi σοί. V. 74. Hic versus vulgo sequitur βελέμενω sic mutatus οὐδ' ἀνελύθηρον. Reposui Æschyleum οὐδάμ' ἔλυθ—: adisis Brunckium ad Pers. 429. et Blomfieldum in Prom. 535. V. 76. Dedi πύμα vice θανάτω. Eandem var. lect. exhibet X. II. 334. in Tioas 778. V. 82. Προῦπάλαμνοι metrum et sensus postulant ἀπάλαμος. V. 86. Male reposui ψίκας κίκληγες vice ψίκας δι λήγαι. Redde gutta cessavit. Etenim ψίκας est gutta ejuslibet liquoris: hic pro sanguinis scil. Agamemnonis exsanguis. V. 100. Vulgo φέρε φέροντ': quæ nemo expedit. V. 101. μένει θέμις δόντος erui ε μένει δε μένοντος. Cf. Æschyl. Suppl. 443. Μένει χερὶ τίνιν Ὀμοία θέμις. Mox δόντος—Διὸς est idem fere ac Θεῶν διδόντων in Hipp. 1432. necnon Διὸς θελότος S. C. Th. 617. V. 107. In προσάφαι hæreo. Reposui πρὸς ὕψος. V. 119. Vulgo ἰάπτων: sed amat Æschylus ἰάλλω mitto. V. 121. Inserui τρεῖνον quod facile omitti poterat propter φρεῖν.

Ad Choephoras accedo. Cujus fabulæ duo carmina Antistrophica olim feliciter suis numeris restitui in *Class. Journ.* No. IX. p. 22. Verum male Epodum distribui, dum voces βέλη ἑπιτάλλων rescui; sic lego:.

τίς δορυσθενὴς ἂν ᾔην
ἀναλυτὴρ δόμων Σκύθης
τὰν χερσὶν πα-
λίντων ἔργα

χ', ὡς Ἀρης, βέλη 'πιτάλλων
σχέδια τ' αὐτόκωπα ναμῶν.

Melius vero rem gessi in ejusdem Diarii No. XIII. p. 168. ubi fassus sum me nihil aut parum in Epodis emendandis proficere posse. Nunc autem metro reperto sensus quoque se prodit. Lege igitur v. 793 et sqq.

Ἐπεὶ νιν μέγαν ἄρας ἐπωδὸς α'.
δίδυμα καὶ πάλιν αὐτρίπλ-
ᾶ φίλων ᾶ-
ποιν' ἀμείψεις.

Vulgo καὶ τριπλᾷ παλίμποινα δίλων. Quoties αὐτὸ post πάλιν excidere soleat, exemplis monet Porsonus ad Iph. T. 1396. De permutatis δίλων et φίλων ipse dixi ad Promethei Epodum I. Vide *Classical Journ.* No. XXII. p. 243.

V. 830 et sqq.

ἐπωδὸς β'.

Περσέως τ'
ἐν φρεσὶν

σχέθων,
ὑποχθονός
πράσσειν τοῖς τ' ἄνω
πράσσειν χάριτας

ὀργᾶς στυγερ-
ᾶς ἐννόη-
θι, φοινίαν τ' ἄταν
τιθείς, τὸν αἰτίν τ'
ἐξαπολλ-
ὺς μόρου.

10

V. 5. Vulgo αἰνῶνι προπράσσειν. Dedi αἶνω τοῖς πρᾶσσειν. Similiter in Hec. 785. super αἶνω Mosq. i. habet τοῖς: unde orta est αἰνῶνι lectio quam Aug. i. exhibet. Mox rectius dicitur πρᾶσσειν χάριτας quam προπράσσειν: cf. Eurip. Ion. 36. et 896. V. 7. Pro λυγρᾶς reposui στυγερᾶς. Excidit σ ob literam praecedentem in voce ὀργᾶς et τυγερᾶς vix distat α λυγρᾶς: quod Codices fortasse exhibebant. De permutatis τ et λ, et γ et π tria sunt omnia. V. 8. Ex ἰνδοθεν olim erui ἰῖδαν ἴσθι. nunc malim ἰννῆθι.

In Eumenidibus sicut in Agamemnone Burnei Antispastica tria systemata repetenda esse jussit; qui rectius disponere potuit v. 328. et seqq.

Carmen illud iteratum exstat ad finem strophæ et Antistrophæ: cujus rei nullum aliud exemplum nunc temporis reperiet lector studiosus; qui bene reponet breve carmen ad finem præeuntis systematis Anapæstorum, sic legendum.

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ τεθυμένῳ τόδε μέλος
παράκοπα παράφορα φρενόδαλις
ὕμνος ἦσ' Ἐρινύων
δέσμους φρενῶν ἀφόρμ-
ιγκτος αἶαν-
ῆς βροτοῖσιν.

Vulgo ἱε': restitui ἦσ': etenim verbum desideratur: mox αὐτὸς nemo intellexit. Æschylea est vox αἰαπῆς: Vide annotata ad Pers. Cl. Jh. No. XXII. p. 246.

V. 776 et sqq.

Ἰὼ ἰὼ θεοὶ
νεώτεροι παλαι-
οὺς νόμους καθιππάσασθε
κάκ' ἡμεῶν εἴλεσθ'· ἐγὼ δ' ἄ-
τιμος αἰαντὶ βαρ-
ύκοτος ἐν γὰρ τᾷ ἔ-

μῶ τὸν ἰόν
ἀντιπενθῇ
μεθεῖσα καρ-
δίας σταλαγμ-
ὸν χθονὶ
ὀύς φορον.

12

ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λι-
χὴν ἄφυλλος
ἄτεκνος, ὡς οἶκα,
πέδον ἐπισυμ-
βροτοφθόρου κηλίδας ἐν
χώρῳ βαλεῖ· στυγνάζομαι,

13

τί ῥέξω; γενοίμ' ἂν
εὐσσοιστος πολίτης·
ἔπαθον ὡς
μέγαλά τοι
ὀστρυχίαισι κούραι
νυκτὸς ἀτιμοπενθεις.

19

15

24

V. 4. Vulgo εἰλισθέ μου. At literæ εμου, hic metro incommode in εμω mutatz reponuntur post τᾷδε, vice φιῷ. V. 5. Vulgo ἡ τέλαινα : quæ scriptura, nisi vehementer erro, nascitur e gl. cum veteri lectione commixta. Ipse Æschyleum αἰαντὶ restitui : restituendum quoque v. 333. ἀφορμηκτος αἰαντὶ βροταῖς vice ἀντά : quam vocem per κρηυγή inter-pretatur Brunckius ad Simonid. Fragm. i. 20. ubi lege αἰαντὶ. V. 6. Deleto φιῷ, dedi ἐμῶ τὸν ἰόν. Libri ἰόν ἰῶ. Nostram scripturam exponit illud Terentianum *omnem itam evomat*. V. 12. Libri *ἀντιπενθεις*. MSS. fortasse εὐφορον. i. e. δυσφορον. In Troas. 616. Ald. εὐφροσύναισι. MSS. δυσφροσύναισι. V. 18. Pro στυγνάζω metrum postulat quadrisylla-bon ; nisi quis in delendum malit. V. 23. Vulgo δυστυχιῷς.

835 et sqq.

Ἐμὲ παθεῖν τάδε γ',
ἐμὲ παλαιόφρον-
α κατὰ γὰρ οἰκείν,
ἀτίστον μῖσος
πνέω τὸν μένους ἅπαντα κότον·
τίς ὑποδύεταιί με πλεῖον ὀύνα;

δύμον αἶε,
μάτερ, αἶε
νύξ· ἀπὸ δαμιάν με τιμᾶν θεῶν
δυσπάλαμοι παρ' οὐδὲν ἤραν δόλοι.

7

V. 4. μῖσος contra metrum. Reposui μῖσος. Res pro persona. Cf. Heracl. 52. v. 5. Vulgo τοι μῖσος ἅπαντά τι. V. 6. Vice πλινθας dedi πλινθ' : adi Porson. ad Hec. 820. V. 8. αὖ iteravi. Vide Scidlerum de Vers. Dochm. p. 278.

Tandem est ventum ad Supplices. E dumetis loci maxime per-plexi mihi viam tali fere ratione expediam.

E v. 832. usque ad 842. nihil nisi lacunas et mendas video : idem dictum puta de v. 855, 6 ; et 865 et sqq. reliquos sic dispono.

843.

στρ. α'.

ἀντιστρ. α'.

ΚΗΡΤΞ. Σοῦσθ' ἐπὶ σοῦσθε
βαῖριν ὁπῶς ποδῶν.

2

ΧΟΡΟΣ. ὦ πολυαἰμων
κράτος ἀποκοπά.

4

Delevi φόβος gl. vocis πολυαἰμων.

850.

στρ. β'.

ΚΗ. βᾶθ' ἄλλα πολύροθον,
 δινήεντα πόρον,
 βάριδι γομφούετ'ω
 δεσπυσύναις τιν' ἄβρεκν σ'
 εὐδαιμονίζω.

μοχ

ΚΗ. ἴτ' ἅπιτ' ἀναπολοῦσα βῆμα

λεῖζ' ἔδρανον· κίε δ' ἐς δόρυ.

*

*

*

*

*

*

861.

ἀντιστρ. β'.

ΧΟ. μήποτε πάλιν ἴδοιμ'
 ἀλφεισίβοιον ὕδωρ,
 ἔνθεν ἀεζόμενον
 νᾶμα βροτοῖσι τίθα-
 λε ζώφρυτον *

μοχ

* * * * *

πολλὰ θροεῖς δὲ μάται' ἴθι·

ἐμὲ πρὶν κακὰ παθεῖν

ὀλομέναις παλάμαις.

Hæc proxima non ambitiose persequar. Lector ipse, si velit, nostram scripturam cum vulgata conferre poterit. Id unum moneo quod ἄβρεκν reddi debet per παλλάκην. Vid. Suid. V. Quod ad εὐδαιμονίζω, cf. Troad. 273. Εὐδαιμονίζει παῖδα σὴν.

V. 874. et sqq. Hos versus omnes in Antistrophica carmina disposui in *Class. Journ.* No. VI. p. 416.

Mirum fortasse nonnullis esse videbitur, quod Æschylus et Euripides se tot et tantis vinculis obstringi vellent, quæ Sophocles sibi impo-
~~re~~ indignatus fuit. Inter hujus enim carmina Epodica vix unum
~~utque~~ alterum reperiēs ad eandem regulam exigendum. Profecto
~~equidem~~ me nescire fateor quare Tragici inter se tantopere dissentiant. Scio tamen ab Aristophane legem esse, quam detexi, servatam, Æschylum fortasse et Euripidem irridendi causa. Verum alio fortasse tempore de Cornici carminibus anquiram.

Etonæ Dabam,

Kalend. Jun. A. S. MDCCCXV.

BENTLEII EMENDATIONES INEDITÆ IN ARISTOPHANEM.

No. IV. [Continued from No. XXIII. p. 111.]

IN EQUITES.

4. Lege εισέφρησεν e Schol. At vid. Suid. in Εισήρρησεν et Ἡρήρ-
 σεν.

9. πενθήσωμεν Ὀλύμπου νόμον Suid. in Ξυναυλιαν.

18. Suid. Κομφευριπικῶς optime.

29. dele τῶν.

38. Ald. ποεῖν [Vid. T. KIDD. ad Porsoni Miscell. Crit. p. 371.]

42. leg. πνυκίτης [sic MSS. 3. et Schol.]
49. Suid. in Κοσκυλματίοις [habet] Κοσκυλματίοις τισί: lege ἄ-
τοισι ab ἄττα ut ὅτοισι in v. 755. [Vid. P. P. DOUBREUX in Porso-
ni Miscell. Crit. p. 390.]
55. Suid. in Μάζα [habet] ἐκ Πύλου—παραδραμῶν—αὐτήν.
59. Hesych. Βυρσίνης, μυρσίνης: vid. v. 447.
62. ποιεῖται Suid. in Μεμακκοακότα.
71. lege ἀνύσανται
86. Scaliger βουλευσαίμεθα [sic Br. tacite.]
89. Ἀληθες; οὗτος κρονοχυτρολήραιοι εἰ. Sic pungendum. male
Scaliger Ἀληθες οὕτως forte Ἀληθες; οὕτως κρονοχυτρολήραιοι εἰ,
ut Plutarch. [De Liber. Educand. ii. p. 13.] χρονόληρος [ubi H.
Steph. voluit κρονόληρος] vel Ἀληθες; οὕτως κρονοχυτρολήραιοι εἰ; ut
χύτραις λημῶν [idem sit atque] Κρονικαῖς λήμαις λημῶντες in Plut.
581. vel Ἀληθες οὗτος ὁ κρονοχυτρολήμιον: vid. Achar. 556. Ran.
864. Vesp. 1403. Av. 174. ib. 1048.
93. κρίνουσι Etymol. in Οἶνος.
103. λείχων Etymol. in Ἐπίπαστα. male.
107. ἔλχ' ἔλχε. Ald. ἔλε χ' ἔλκε: vel leg. ἔχε χ' ἔλκε: vid.
1184. ἔχε καὶ πιεῖν. Vesp. 1130. Ἐχε—καὶ μὴ λαλεῖ.
121. φήσιν lege φήσ' [sic Kust. cf. 195.]
124. διεσχρήτο Athenæus xi. p. 460.
134. ἀνήρ: lege αὐ [sed melius DOUBREUX in *Monthly Rev.*
Append. V. lii. p. 522. ἂν ἀνὴρ ἑτερος collato v. infr. 928.]
136. fo. ὁ Παφλαγών. semper enim hic primam corripit. [Sic
MSS.]
164. In Schol. φησὶ γὰρ ἄρξεις τοῦ λαοῦ: leg. ἐλεοῦ: cf. 152. et
169. et Hesych. V. Ἀρχέλας—τοῦ ἐλαίου leg. ἐλεοῦ.
165. lege Πινυκός. [sic Kust. in Not. et MSS. 3.]
167. In Schol. Αἰκιάσεις—σιτήσεις—ὄθεν καὶ λαικάστρια ἢ πόρνη.
adscriptis Benti. [ex Hesychio] Αἰσίτος κύναιδος, πόρνη. quod pro-
pius accedit ad σιτήσεις.
174. Scal. Χαλκηδόνα: Vide Palmer. et ad 1300.
175. Cf. Av. 178. [Vid. ad 1160.]
187. Melior altera lectio apud Schol. ὅσον. Vid. 1215, 6. Av.
1616. Pac. 888. [Plura habes apud Porson. ad Androm. 651.
Advers. p. 225.]
- Ibid. leg. λέλογχας, sed cf. Pac. 591.
193. lege ἐς. [Causam non video.]
208. lege ἐσθ' ὃ τ' [sic, ni fallor, ELMSELEIUS.]
209. leg. τοῦ βυρσαίτου Ἡδὴ κρατήσιν.
219. Bas. ἅπαντα τὰ πρὸς πολιτείαν: dele τὰ. [Sic MSS. 3.]
238. leg. ἐσθ' ὅπως [sic MS. Rav.]
242. leg. παραγένεσθε [sic Brunck.]
245. ὁμοῦ προκειμένων. leg. ὁμοῦ πικραιμένον vid. p. 17. [non in-

telligo quid Bentleius velit.] et v. 266. *Ξυεπικεῖσθ'* : an leg. *προσκειμένον* : vid. 758. *προσκεισθαι* : [Kuster. habet *προσκειμένων*.]

262. Ipse Schol. legebat *ἀγκυλίσας* : male. [Vid. VV. DD. ad Iph. T. 1408.]

263. *ἐνεκολάβησας* Suid. in *Ἀγκύρισμα*, et *Ἐκολάβησας*. lege *ἐνεκολήβασας* ex Hesychio. Vid. et *Κοληβάζειν* et *Κολοιβάζειν*. Ego malim *ἐνεκολάβρισας*. Vid. Hesych. *Κολαβρίζειν*. Sed *κοληβάζειν* ut *κυρηβάζειν* v. 272. [Brunckius quoque *ἐνεκολήβασας*.]

Ibid. In Schol. *ἄκλος* lege *κόλαβος*. ὁ μικρὸς ζωμὸς Suid. sed vid. Hesych. in *Ἐνεκολήβασε*.

Ibid. Schol. *ἀργυρίζεται*.] leg. *ἀγκυρίζεται*.

270. *ὥσπερὶ* Suid. in *Ἐπέρχεται*. Sed forte *χῶσπερὶ*.

272. *Εἰ δ' ἐκκλίνει γε* Suid. in *Κυρηβάσει*. [MS. Rav. ἦν δ' ἐκκλίνῃ.]

277. Cf. Thesm. 100.

287. lege σὲ [sic Brunck. e Prisciano, p. 234. fol. vers. éd. Ald. = 1187. Putsch.]

292. lege vel *ἐς ἔμ'* vel *εἰς μ'* [et sic MS. Rav.] Etymol. V. *Σκαρδαμύσειν* habet *εἰς ἔμει* [necnon Suid. V. *Ἀσκαρδαμυκτί*.]

300. fo. *φανῶ γῶ*. vid. Vchar. 827. vel σέ γε *φανῶ*. vid. Ach. 914. καὶ σέ γε *φανῶ* : immo *φαίνω* : cf. ibid. 917. *ἐπειτα φαίνεις*. Athen. m. p. 94. D. *Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἰππεῦσι, καὶ σε φήσω ἀδεκατεύτους κυλίας πωλεῖν*.

303. στρ. α'. 381. ἀντιστρ. α'. 322. στρ. β'. 396. ἀντιστρ. β'. [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 189.]

304. dele καὶ *κέκρακτα τοῦ*.

312. leg. *ἦμιν μοχ* Suid. *Ἀνακεκώφκας*.

319. Bas. Καὶ νῆ Δία καμὲ τοῦτ' ἔδρασε. Ald. καὶ delet. Scribe καμὲ ἢν Δία [et sic Kuster.] vel καμὲ τοῦτ' ἔδρασε, νῆ Δί' [sic Porson. Praef. Hec. p. xlv.]

325. dele τῶν [sic HERMANN. l. c.]

327. *Ἰππῶδαμος* Suid. in *Δείβεται*. [monuit idem Kuster.]

330. *πάρεστι ὅλος*.] lege *παρέλθων ὅλος* Vid. Schol. [MSS. rectius *πάρεστι*.]

331. lege ex Antistrophæ versu *πανουργία* deleto ἐν. [sic MSS. 2.]

338. οὐ μὰ Δί' : dele οὐ [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 153.]

339. ἐγὼ σ' οὐ : lege σ' ἐγὼ οὐ [sic Brunck.]

340. leg. *πάρες πάρες πρὸς* : [sic MSS. 4. et Junt.]

341. lege *ἐναντὶ* [Hotilius. Lect. Aristoph. p. 62. *ἐναντα*. BURNEIUS *Monthly Rev. Sept.* 1789. p. 253. *λέγειν ἐναντίον μου*.]

357. καὶ *Νικίαν ταράξω*. Cur hoc ? cum *Nicias* et *Demosthenes* hic ab ejus partibus stent. for. καὶ *σφηκίαν ταράξω* : ut Vesp. 229. *σφηκίαν διασκηδῶ*. Sed de *Nicia* adolescente *Rhetore* vid. Eccl. 428. *ὁμοίος Νικίᾳ*. *Atheneus* p. 94. in utroque loco agnoscit *Νικίαν*.

[*neon* Plutarch. in Nicia p. 525. citatus a Kustero.]

359. lege *μόνον*. At *μόνος* Suid. in *Περσίστασι*.

365. lege *κάμέ γ' ἔλκε* τοῦτον ἦνπερ ἔλκε vel *κάμέ γ' ἔλκ' ἦνπερ*.

369. In Schol. *σώματος*] leg. *δέρματος*.

366. στρ. 469. *ἀντιστρ.*

373. leg. *πρηγοῶνα*.

384. leg. *οὐκ ἄρ' ἦν*. Vid. Schol. [sic MSS. 4.]

388. leg. *ἐὰν* [sic Brunck.]

393. Suid. in *Ἀμώμενοι* habet *λέγεται*: an leg. *γλίσχεται*: sed *βούλεται* idem in *Ἀφάυει*.

399. In Schol. legn̄ Bentl. *Ἄλλ' ἐπανατρέψαι βούλομαι γ' εἰς τὸν λόγον Πρότερον* ἐκείνος πρὸς ἑτέραν γυναῖκα ἔχων τὸν νοῦν κακῶς εἶποι πρὸς ἑτέραν ἄλλ' ἅμα—

400. *Μορσίμω* Suid. in *Κώδιον*. ut *Μορσίμου* in *Μόρσιμος*.

405. Schol. *παιδοπίπην*. At *πυρρόπιπην* Suid. in *Ἦ* περὶ πάντα.

406. καὶ *παιῶνα* δῆ. Suid. *ἢ παιωνίσαι* in *Ἦ* περὶ πάντα c Schol.

γρ. παιωνίσαι ἢ ἡσθέντ' ἢ παιῶν ἄσαι [ut duo MSS.]

Ibid. Antiphanes apud Athen. p. 508. *Ἐπειτα μηδὲν τῶν ἀπρηχαιωμένων τούτων περὶ τὸν Τελάμωνα μηδὲ τὸν Παιῶνα μηδ' Ἀρμόδιον*.

410. *μαχαιρίδων* Pollux X. 104.

412. 3. Suid. *Ἀπομαγδαλίας*.

417. *ῥᾶτ' ἄρα* Suid. in *Νέα χελιδών*.

419. fo. delend. *ὡς*: vid. 435. [sic Porson. Præf. p. xli.]

420. In Schol. *ἀνισπρόν γ'* [Vide Porson. Advers. p. 33. et seq.]

422. lege *κοχῶνα* dualis numeri. Hesych. *Κοχῶνα*. τὰ ἰσχυία.

Sed vid. 482. [unde patet Bentl. voluisse τὰς *κοχῶνας* quod MSS. 3. habent.]

Ibid. leg. *ἀπώμνον* [et sic Brunck.]

426. leg. *ἐπιώρκεις* [sic Brunck.]

428. Cf. 757.

433. In Schol. fo. *Εὐ οἷδ' ἐκείνος* [atqui vera lectio est *ὁμοῦ δ'*.

Vid. Archiloch. Fragm. xxviii.]

435. *γε* deest in Frob.

Ibid. lege *κακίας* [quasi voluisset Bentl. καὶ *αἰκίας*.]

Ibid. In Schol. ad *Νότον* scripsit. "Stulte interpretatur *Νότον*. nam *Cæcias* a *Solstitio* astivo flat. Hinc autem, quod *κακίας* παρωδεῖ poeta, Salmasii error arguitur qui *καϊκίας* scribit *τετρασυλλαβῶς* in *Notis* ad *Solinum*."

Ibid. Ad finem Schol. *Κάκ' ἐφ' αὐτὸν ἔλκων ὡς ὁ Καϊκίας νέφος*.

443. fo. *ἀλιτηγῶν* Soph. [Ced. C. 363.] et Suid. in *Ἀλιτήριος*.

463. leg. *πράττει* [sic Brunck.]

469. fo. *αὐθ'*: vid. 499.

470. leg. *ξυνώμνυτε* [sic MSS. 2.]

501. leg. *πρόεχτε* [vid. ad *Nub.*]

505. In Argumento Nubium sic habetur 'Ηνάγκαζεν λέγοντας ἔπη πρὸς τὸ Θίατρον [sic Porsonus in *Maty's Rev.* = *Miscell. Crit.* p. 28. et Praef. p. lv.]

510. ὥς. fo. πῶς.

519. In Schol. Βατραχός: leg. βατραχίς. [sic Kuster. in Not.]

524. παρασύρων Suid. in Στάσις. At παρασύρας Etymol. in 'Αφελές.

526. συμποσίους Suid. in 'Αφέλεια.

531. In Schol. νικήση. Suid. σε φιλήση in Κονῶς μέθυσος.

535. ἡμᾶς Suid. in Στυφελισμούς.

541. leg. τούτων οὖν [Ita MS. Rav. Kusterus γοῦν probante Brunckio.]

543. Suidas 'Αποπέμψατ' ἐφ' ἑνδεκα: an leg. παραπέμψατέ θ' ἑνδεκα: at Suid. 'Εφ' ἑνδεκα.

549. ἵππων: leg. ὀπλῶν [ungularum: vid. Schol.]

559. In Schol. μῶρον: Ald. μῦθον.

561. Scal. παρεστός.

566. leg. κοῦτις [sic Porson. *Maty's Rev.* = *Misc. Crit.* p. 34.]

567. "leg. 'Ηξέμυσεν ut Suid. MStus. ubi codd. vulgati ἡρίμυσεν." Lud. Kuster.

569. τοῦτ' exhibet Suid. in 'Απεψησάμην et Ψευδόπτωμα. lege κάρτ'.

577. In Schol. Suid. in Στλεγγίς habet Οὐδ' ἐστὶν αὐτή.

580. fo. leg. πολι—ταῖς.

597. καὶ ante σκόροδα deest in Athen. xi. p. 483. D.

602. leg. μετήσαν [sic MSS. 2.]

605. leg. ἔφη [sic ed. Junt. et MSS. 2.] et similiter in Schol.

607. leg. μήτε γῆ [sic Brunck.]

615. leg. εἰργασμέν' [sic MSS. 2.] vel ἐργασάμεν' [sic HERMANN. de Mettis. p. 367.]

616. fo. ἄπαν.

626. leg. πιθανώταθ' ἢ βουλή δ' [sic Membr.]

627. Suid. Ψευδατραφάξυς.

630. leg. τοῖς [sic MSS. 2.]

631. Suid. Σχιταλοι τε καὶ Φεν. Sed Σχιτάλοι ut Κόβαλοι Σχίταλοι etiam Hesych. sed forte Σχιμάλοι, ἀπὸ τοῦ σκιμαλίζειν. Vid. Ach. 443.

632. Βερέσχειοι. Suidas quoque agnoscit et in Σχίταλοι: sed nihil addit unde dictum. Equidem mendosum putaverim et scripserim 'Ερέσχειοι: quod dictum ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐρεσχελεῖν sensu aptissimo.

Ibid. fo. μόθων [sic Kuster.]

634. leg. γλώτταν [sic MSS.]

641. leg. ἐξήραξα [sic Brunck.]

645. leg. ἀποβέρτην ποιησαμένοις Ταχύ.

659. Athen. vii. p. 328. γίνονται: fo. μένουν' ἄν. Sed et Attici sic ut alibi. Τί δῆτα πόδες ἄν οὐκ ἄν εἰργασαίητο. [Av. 1147.]

669. Scal. ἰστυκότες. at recte ἰσθηκότις. surrexerunt scil. abiturī.

670. Suid. ἰρρέτω. Vid. Lys. 129.

677. Suid. Ὑπερ ἐπυπάζοντο : fo. χ' ὑπερ—

680. leg. πέπραγας [sic MSS. 4.]

683. fo. δόλοις et ῥήμασιν θ' [sic MSS. 2.]

690. lege με μορμών : sed Eustath. [Il. Σ. = 1204. Bas. necnon Suid. V. Μορμῶ] μορμῶ τοῦ θράσους i. e. ᾧ τοῦ [vel φεῦ τοῦ] θρ.

694. fo. περιεκόκκισα. At Suid.—κυσα in Ἀπεπυδάρισα.

697. leg. ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἦν μή σ' ἐκπίω.

713. leg. καθ' ὥσπερ [sic Dawes. et MS.]

718. Suid. in Ἠρωκτὸς habet τοῦτόγε. voluit, credo, τουτογι [MS. Rav. τοῦτό τι. unde ELMSLEIGH ad Achar. 108. in Auctar. τουτογι.]

723. leg. δημακίδιον : vid. 820. ubi tamen δημακίδιον Qdam producit. an legend. ᾧ φίλτατον δημίδιον.

739. leg. ὑποδραμῶν τοὺς ἐκ πύλου. Vid. Nub. 186. Eq. 1198. [sed melius Br. ὑποδραμῶν τοὺς ἐν πύλῳ e Scholiastæ verbis.]

748. fo. ὡς τὸ πρόσθε : vid. Nub. 593. Ach. 241. [sic Brunck. tacite post Casaubonum.]

753. στρ. 832. ἀντιστρ.

Ibid. In Schol. epigramma est Crinagoræ.

754. φρονεῖν καὶ λόχους Suid. in Νῦν.

756. fo. εὐμήχανος πορίζειν cf. Eccl. 236. πορίζειν εὐποράτατον [sic Brunck. collato Æsch. Prom. 59. δεινὸς γὰρ εὐρεῖν.]

757. ἔσει. leg. ῥέουσι : ut πολλῶ ῥέοντι [cetera legere nequeo. At cf. Polluc. IV. 21. πολλῶ ῥέων.]

Ibid. Cf. 128.

758. Suid. in Δελφὶν habet προσικίσθαι σου [et sic Rav.]

Ibid. In Schol. fo. Ὁ δὲ δελφίς τε : μοχ pro κέλεος Salmas [Plinian. Exerc. p. 402.] κερουχος ὁ διακόψει : vel potius ὅς : ut Aristophanei Anapaesti sint : μοχ fo. τὸ σκάφος [at τοῦδαφος agnoscit Schol. Thucyd. VII. 41.]

760. leg. τῇ δεσποίνῃ μὲν Ἀθηναίῃ.

773. lege χαριστοίμην. [ita Brunck.]

778. dele ἐν : vid. 1331. Ach. 697. Thesm. 813. Epigramma apud Suid. in Ποικίλῃ στοά. [sic quoque Brunck. collato Critiæ versu apud Athen. p. 28. C.]

780. leg. τῆς πέτρας vid. 751.

784. leg. ὡς τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τοῦργον.

789. leg. ταῖς πιδάκναισι [sic Dawes. et MSS.]

790. γυπαρίοις. Et si præter Scholiastem Hesych. et Suid. hanc lectionem agnoscant, tamen eas interpretationes ex solo hoc loco profluxisse credo, et lego Καὶ γυργαθίοις καὶ πυργυθίοις : certe cum πιδάκναις convenit. an leg. Καὶ καλυβαρίοις. Καλύβας in illa parte memorat Thucydides.

790. leg. ἐλεαίρι.

794. ῥοδοπυγίζων Suid. et Schol. Hesych. ῥαθαπυγίζων.
 799. leg. ἀρπάξης [sic MS.]
 800. καθορᾶται Suid. in Ὀμίχλη.
 803. στεμφύλων. fo. σταφυλῶν vel καὶ τήμπέλῳ ut Pac. 556. Cf. et infr. 1297. ἀλλήλαις ξυνελθεῖν τὰς τριήρεις εἰς λόγον.
 806. leg. σαυτοῦ [ita Brunck.]
 818. παῦ οὔτοσί. lege παῦ ὦ οὔτος : vid. Vesp. 1355. vel οὔτωσί. [sic Kuster.] an παύου οὔτος vel παῦε παῦ οὔτος Vid. 915. Vesp. 37.
 [820. Olim voluit Benth. δημακίδιον ὦν. sed postea sententiam mutavit ob dicta ad v. 723.]
 823. leg. χειροῖν [ita Brunck.]
 840. Suid. Ἐμοὶ δὲ τοιούτων.
 851. κατασπᾶσαντες Suid. in Βριμήσαιο. [et sic MS. Rav.]
 861. ὅταν : fo. ὅ γ' ἄν :
 863. Etymol. in Ἐγχελὺς et Athen. vii. p. 299. αἰροῦσι [sic MSS.]
 865. dele γε [sic Brunck.]
 869. leg. ὅσων γ'.
 871. leg. τοσουτοί : [quod comprobaturus est fortasse ELMSLEIUS.]
 873. Γρύπον Suid. in Γρύττον.
 874. βινουμένους Suid. in Βινεῖν et Γρύττος : sed vid. Nub. 1099.
 877. leg. τηλικούτον [sic Brunck.]
 880. Suid. Τοιουτονί.
 887. leg. σὺ δ' οἶμαζ ὦ πόνω πόνηροι.
 888. Αἰβοί· Οὐκ ἐς κόρακας : ut αἰβοί sit extra versum, ut φεῦ et similia : sic An. 1342. De πόνω πόνηρε vid. Vesp. 464. Lys. 350. et Hesych.
 903. fo. καὶ τοῦτό γ' ἐπιτηδὲς [et sic ELMSLEIUS Edinburgh Rev. No. 37. p. 87.]
 891. leg. τὸν σιλφίου.
 895. leg. τοῦτ' εἶπε Κόπριος ἀνὴρ. Suid. Κόπριος ἀνὴρ : vel dele καὶ [voluit quoque Benth. fortasse καὶ deletō] πρὸς ἐμὲ τοῦτ' ἀνὴρ Κοπρεαῖος εἶπε.
 905. fo. ὀφθαλμῖω.
 917. An leg. δετῶν α δεταί, λαμπάδες δᾶδες. Suid. in Ὑφελκτίον habet τῶν δᾶδων καὶ ἀπαρυστέον τῶν κρεῶν. fo. τῶν δαδίων vel δαλίων. Vid. Suid. in Δάλιον et Pac. 959. [ubi Benth. reposuit δάλιον e Suida in V.]
 965. Suid. Σμηκίθην [et Kuster.]
 971. leg. τοῖς ἀφιζομένοισιν ἐ—ἀν κλ- vel τοῖσι δεῦρ' ἀφικνουμένοις [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 232.]
 977. γένοιθ' Suid. in Λοιδυξ. Scal. γενεθ' [et sic HERMANN. l. c.]
 979. lege δύο cum Suid. [sic MSS.]
 980. In Schol. Suidas in Τορύνη legit ἐννοδόχον : sed recte ἐννο-

δόνον [etenim Ald. ἐπιδοδόνον] ἀπὸ τοῦ δονεῖν : quippe est τὸ κινήτριον τοῦ ἔττους. Lego etiam Τορύνην τέως ὥς δὴ ξίφος ὑπεζωσμένος. Male Kusterus [Verba inter Scholia suo auctori vindicat Kuster. ad Κνήστις et Toup. ad Suid. V. Τανάχαλκος. nempe Leonidæ Tarentini Ep. xiv.]

987. λαβεῖν Suid. in Δωριστί.

992. lege δωροδοκιστὶ ut Suid. in Δωριστί : sed —κηστὶ in Τὴν Δωριστὶ [et sic MSS. 3.]

996. Vid. Ran. 1211.

Ibid. κῖβωτός : vid. Vesp. 1051.

1006. [Fortasse Bentl. περὶ ἀπάντων πραγμάτων delere voluit : sed mentem ejus non satis bene video.]

1019. leg. Ἐρεχθιδεῖ κολοίοις.

1025. leg. δῆτ'. [olim δῆ.]

1039. leg. ἔφραζεν Vid. 1045. [sic Brunck.]

1083. In Schol. "Ex Schol. in Av. 1379. et Suid. in Κυλλὰς lege "Οτι χαλὸς ἐστὶ τὴν ἑτέραν χεῖρ' οὐ λέγεις."

1088. lege μοι ὅκει vel μου ὅκει vid. 997.

1092. Suid. Ἀριβάλλω.

1115. πρὸς τε τὸν Frob. et Suid. in Εὐπαράγωγος.

1123. ταπεινῶσαι Suid. in Βρύλλων e gl.

1128. ποίοις Suid. in Πυκνός.

1139. Froben. περιεύχομαι. Ald. περιερχ— et Suid. in V.

1160. leg. εἰ γὰρ [Conferre poterat Bentl. 175. et Av. 178.]

1175. Ὀβριμοπάτρα Athen. p. 94. E.

1202. leg. οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ [Mentem Bentleii non intelligo : vid. ad Ran. 103.]

1215. leg. ὅσων [sic Reiskius et MSS. 3.]

1227. lege οὐ δέσσει μ' [sic BURNÆIUS in Monthly Rev. Feb. 1796.]

1237. Ald. κλέπτων recte. [sic MSS.]

1249. Οὐχὶ μᾶλλον vice οὐκ ἂν Suid. in Οὐχί. In Alcest. 180. hodie habetur οὐκ ἂν.

1253. ἔσομαι Suid. in Φανός. [sic Porsonus in, Maty's Rev. = Misc. Crit. p. 35.]

1265. Ald. Θόμαντιν sed in Schol. Θούμαντιν ut alibi vid. Schol. Av. 1406. Θούφραστος [Vesp. 1305.] Θουκυδίδης [Ach. 703.] [Adde Θουφάνης Eq. 1100.]

Ibid. τὸν ἀνέστιον Suid. in Ἀνέστιος Θούμαντις Αυσίστρατος [et sic Rav.]

1266. λυπεῖν Suid. in Αυσ— : λιπεῖν in Ανισ— et Θουμ— At ἰς Αυσίστρατον non convenit cum λυπεῖν.

1268. lege βαλεροῖς et [in antistrophico] 1294. ἂν ὅμως [MSS. ἀλλ' ὅμως teste Brunckio.]

1270. Πυθῶνι ἰν : lege Πυθῶδ' ἰών : vid. Av. 188. ἰέναι—Πυθῶδε.

1272. Λοιδορῆσθαι Suidas. vid. Pac. 57. sed λοιδορῆσαι in Lys. 1130.

1275. Suid. "Οστις οὐκ.

1279. fo. ἡχθόμην.

1282. Steph. Byz. Κασσώριον. lege simplici σ. non σσ : ex lege metri et ordine literarum. sequitur vocem Καστώλου. Scribe ergo hic 'Εν Κασωρίοισι. Suid. Κάσσωρος. Idem tamen Κασαυρίοισι. Hesych. utrumque et Κασαυρεῖον et Κασωρεῖον.

1286. lege οὐποτ' : ut Suid. in Πολυμνηστεια.

1291. lege φασὶ μὲν γάρ.

1300. fo. Χαλκήδονα : cf. 174. et vide Palmer.

1308. lege 'Αθηναίοις—δοκεῖ.

1316. lege ἐπίκουρ' ὡ λαμπρὸν φέγγος vel ἐπίκουρε φανείς καὶ [et sic Valck. ad Hipp. 1122.] vid. 149. 456. et 832.

1321. forte πολαν σκευή [sic spatio interposito] χολος γε- γίνηται.

1324. lege ταῖς φαινομέναις ταῖσδ'.

1329. leg. τιτιγοφόρος κάρχαίω vel — φορῶν ἀρχαίω.

1331. lege τοῦ Μαραθῶνι. vid. Ach. 697.

1335. Olim deleverat γάρ : mox adscripsit " Immo lege γάρ et οἱ ἴδρας."

1336. Ald. ἦν.

1349. leg. τοῦτ' [aliter Elmsleius ad Achar. 178. in Auctario.]

1367. μετεγγραφήσεται Suid. in Κατάλογος. [sic Brunck.]

1378. Scal. hunc versum obelisco jugulat. [Vid. Schol.]

1389. leg. ἐλαβεῖς αὐτὰς [ita Brunck.]

1390. lege σύ γε vel σὺ μὴ [sic MSS.] vel μὴ συλλάβῃς.

IN ACHARNENSES.

9. In Schol. Αἶμναις : fo. Αἡμνῖαις fab. Aristoph. [ita Kuster.]

10. lege δὴ 'κεχῆνη vel κέχνηα : prius verum. et sic Etymol. in 'Επειοῖκειν [p. 84. fol. vers. Ald. = 386. Sylb.]

18. dele γε et sic Suid. in 'Ρύπτομαι [ita Porson Maty's Rev. p. 65. = Misc. Crit. p. 29.]—23. 'Αωρία Suid.

68. vel dele articulum vel potius lege ἐτροχόμεθα [sic Brunck.]

78. καταφαγεῖν τε : dele κατα vel τε [sic MS.]

86. Athen. p. 130.

96. νεωρικὸν Schol. [νεώριον in Kust.]

103. Ald. ὕμιν.—105. sic dispone ΔΙ—ΚΗ. [sic MSS.]

106. ΔΙ.

108. ΚΗ.

109. ΔΙ.

110. deletur ΔΙ.

108. leg. ὅδε γε.

113. Σαρδιανικόν : leg. Σαρδιανικόν. Et sic Suid. "Ἰνα μὴ σε βάψω.

} sic MSS.

Ald. Σαρψεινιακόν. At in Schol. habet σαρδιανικόν. Vid. Hesych. in Βάμμα Σαρδανικόν.

114, 5. ἀνανεύει et ἐπινεύει lineis circumdedit Bentl. [sic alii.]

116. ἐνθάδ' Suid. in Αὐτόθεν.

119. ἐξυρμήνε et Τοιβνδε δὴ Suid. in Κλεισθένην [Ita ELMSS.]

120. In Schol. ἐπῶν leg. ἐπαδῶν.

Ibid. παρῶδην.] Immo non parodia, sed vera lectio est τοιάνδε—
πυγῇ.

[127. In Schol. lege Πεκταμέναι νεύκονται θύραι Tyrwhitt.]

128. οὐδέ ποτ' ἴσχει γ' ἡ θύρα Suid. in Ἰσχει [Ita Brunck.]

134. dele KH. θεῶρ' et sic Ald. [ita tacite Br.]

144. leg. ἔγραψ' et sic Ald. [ita MSS. et Dawes. p. 250.] ἔγρα-
φον Suid. in Καλοί.

158. lege ἀποτεθρίακεν ex Hesych. et Suid. in Ἀποτεθ-. Ὀδομ-
Πέος.

161. lege μέν τ' ἂν γ' [ita Brunck.] vel ἄρ'.

179. lege potius στυπτοί a στύφειν. [ita MSS. 2.] Erotianus ci-
tat in serie sua Στεριφνοί quod potius στρυφνοί [esset] Hesych.
Στρυφνόν, ἀπεστυμμένον. sed Etymol. in Ἀτεράμων habet στυπτοί.
idem in sua serie male Σιπτοί.

199. } dele { AM. } [sic MS.]

200. } { ΔΙ. }

199. fo. κλαίειν κελεύων. [Hoc tuetur Schol. et MSS. illo non
opus est.]

203. Inter Schol. "Immo tria tantum τριέρρυθμα. cetera διέρρυθμα."

209. τῶν ante ἐμῶν omittit Suid. in Φάυλλος.

216. dele ἐξέφυγεν. est interpretatio τοῦ ἀπεπλίξατο [sic ELMSS.]

217. ἂν Suid. in Ἀπεπλίξατο : at ᾧδ' in Φάυλλος.

219. lege Λακρατεῖδη : at Suid. et Hesych. Λακρατίδας.

229. leg. ἀντεμπαγῶ : vid. [325.] 526. Ἀντεξέκλεψαν. quin et
Suid. in Σχοῖνος habet ἀντεμπαγῶ. et iterum in Σχόλοι. in editione
Kusteri qui perperam hanc lectionem damnat : ego vero divinave-
ram. [sic ELMSS.]

237. legē σίγα—ἄρα [sic Br.]

262. leg. Βακχίου [ita Scaliger.]

267. περιποιησόμενος Suid. in Λαμάχων.

270. leg. πολλῶ—ἴσθ' [ita MSS. Dawes. et Scal.]

272. Στρυμωδῶρου Suid. in Φέλλα : Vid. Vesp. 233. at Στρυμω-
in Θράτταν. vid. Argument. Lysistratæ.

274. Collato Thesm. 1221. legisse velle videtur Bentl. καταλα-
βόντα.

278. In Schol. ὡς καλλίας δηλοῖ. leg. καὶ ἄλλως δηλοῖ scil. Lys.
107.

283, 4, 5. στρ. α'.

334, 5, 6. ἀντιστρ. α'.

286. et quinque sqq. στρ. β'. 337. et sqq. ἀντιστρ. β'.

293. στρ. γ'. 341. ἀντιστρ. γ'.
 296. et sqq. στρ. δ'. 343. et sqq. ἀντιστρ. δ'.
 293. lege vel σοῦ γ' ἢ γὰρ 'κούσομ' ut 302 vel ἀκούσαιμεν.
 294. lege καὶ καταχάσσομεν.
 295. lege πρὶν ἂν γ' ἀκούσῃτ' [ita ELMSSL.]
 300. ποτε omittit Suid. in Κατατεμῶ et Καττύματα. Cretici fient hoc modo—γὰρ κατατεμῶ ποθ' ἰππεῦσιν ἐς καττύματα ut alibi δερῶ σε θύλακον κλοπῆς. [Eq. 369.]
 320. fo. ἤμιν. —321. οὐδ' inserit Bentl. [sic MSS.]
 324. ἄρ' omittit Ald. lege χ' ὁμᾶς vel δῆξομ' ἄρ [ita Dawes.]
 328. leg. 'Αχαρνικοῖσι; μῶν ὁμῶν [ita ELMSSL.]
 335. ἄρα: leg. σύ.
 336. ante ἀρτίως inserit Bentl. ὁμῆς [sic MSS.]
 337. leg. νυνὶ [ita ELMSSL.]
 338. leg. ὅττω [Scal. ὅτῳ c. Schol.]
 340. leg. τοὺς λίθους νῦν μοι [ita Brunck.] vel τοὺς μὲν νῦν λίθους [ita ELMSSL.]
 345. Schol. στρόφιγγι pro var. lect. leg. ergo 'Ὡς ὁδὶ γε σεισιτὸς ἅμα τε τῇ στρόφιγγι γίνεσθαι. et Trochaicus respondere debet Strophæ—γὰρ κατατεμῶ τοῖσιν ἰππεῦσιν ποτ' ἐς καττύματα.
 [346. Tyrwhitt. fo. Βοῆν [sic Rav.] et mox ἀπέθανετ'.]
 346. Male Scholiastes: Distingue post βοῆς: quod vocativus pluralis est α βοῆς, θύλακος.
 347. fo. Παρνήθιοι: Vid. Steph. Byz. V. Πάρνης. Suid. Παρνάσιοι.
 349. Erotianus in Μαριλῆνοι legit ὑπὸ μαρίλης ἀλόσυχην. leg. ἀλὸς ἄχνην vel ἀλοσύχην: sed recte τῆς μαρίλης συχὴν, ut Pac. 167. τῆς γῆς πολλήν.
 350. ἐπ—Suid. in 'Επετίλησεν, ἰάρκος et Μαρίλη.
 361. lege πόθος ἄρα γε πάνυ με.
 362. φονεῖς: immo leg. φρονεῖς [et sic MSS.] et ὅττι.
 367. Hesych. quousque agnoscit Οὐκ ἐνασπιδώσομαι. forte tamen οὐ γένος προδῶσομαι. vid. Nub. 1222. et Av. 1451.
 387. σκυτοδατυ—Suid. in 'Αἶδος κοῆ.
 391. σκῆψιν ἀγών—οὐ προσδέχεται Suid. in Σισυφρος. fo. ἀγών [Porson *Maty's Rev.* p. 65. = *Misc. Crit.* p. 29. ἀγών.]
 399. τραγωδίαν Suid. in 'Αναβάδην. Αὐτὸς. Οὐκ. Ἐνδον.
 400. fo. σοφῶς [sic Markland. Suppl. 639.]
 403 et 406. Ex hemistichiis duobus unus senarius efficitur.
 412. fo. πτωχοὺς [sic Tyrwhitt.]
 422. leg. ὠνῆρ [sic Brunck.] sed vid. 473.
 434. καὶ κακόπτα Suid. in Διόπτα.—436. dele μοι [sic Brunck.]
 451. εὐριπίδη Suid. in Γλίσχρος: Εὐριπίδης in Αἰπαρῆ. lege et distingue Γλίσχρος προσαϊτῶν λιπαρῶν Εὐριπίδη [sic ELMSSL.] vel ὦ εὐριπίδη: vid. ad 474. et Thesm. 4.

452. σπυρίδι διακεκαυμένον λύχνον Suid. in Διακεκαυμένον: at σπυρίδιον διακεκαυμένω λύχνω in Σπυρίδιον.

453. γε. omitit Suid. in Διακεκαυμένον. fo. σσ [ita ELMsL.]

457. μὴ ἄλλα: vid. Ran. 103.

458. κυλίχιον Suid. in Ἀποκεκρουσμένον et Κύλιξ. at κοτυλίσκιον Athen. p. 479. B.

Ibid. ἀποκεκομμένον. Eustath. sed ἀποκεκρουσμένον Excerpt. et Eustath. [p. 1282. = 1389.] notante Casaub.

462. Aid. σφογγίω.

474. Suid. in φιλάτιον habet ὦ Εὐρυπίδιον γλυκύτατον ὦ φιλάτιον. lege ὦ εὐρυπίδιον (vid. ad Thesm. 4.)—φιλαίτατον. Vid. Hesych. [Φιλαίτατος] et Eustath. [Od. B. p. 1441 = 90] ex Xenoph. Hist. Gr. vii. 3. 7. ubi Eustathii teste ed. Rom. alii libri legunt φιλέτατον. et φιλότατον teste ed. Bas.]

479. an ἐκπορευτέα [sic tacite Dawes. p. 253.]

488. τί φήσεις] fo. ἀνερ. (sic.)

[509]. f. καυτοῖς. Tyrwhitt. Ita MS. Rav.]

511. Suid. Παρακεκομμένα ut mox in 516. vel leg. ἐστ' ἀμπέλια παρακεκομμένα.

519. ἴδοιαν Suid. in Σίκιον. [vid. Dawes. p. 253.] olim voluit Bentl. γε σίκιον εἶδεν vel σίκιον ὄν.]

529. In Schol. legit Bentl. χῶσπερ οἱ γὰρ δρομεῖς Ἑκκαίδεκαποδ' ἔρει—αὐτῶ—ἐπικάθιζεν—et addit ex Aristide Orat. pro 4 vir. p. 215. Ῥητὼρ γὰρ ἐστὶ νῦν τις εἴ γ' ἐστὶν λέγειν Ὁ Βουζύργης ἀριστος ὦ λιτήριος, [quos versus posse crui viderant neque Toup. ad Longin. c. xx xiv. neque Wytttenbach. ad Plutarch. S. N. V. p. 7.]

530. leg. Ἥστραπ' [e Plin. Epist. i. 20.]

532. lege μῆτε γῇ vid. Vesp. 22. [rectius citasset Eq. 610.]

[534. fo. πείνων ἄδην. Tyrwhitt.]

562. leg. οὔτι [non improbante ELMsL.]

576. Κακορροεῖ Suid. et alii: sed rectius videtur κακορροεῖ a κακορροῦς [at ὁ corripit debet ante θρ. innotente Dawesio]

583. Suid. Μαρμώ. 608. Ἀμήγεροι. 610. Ἐνή.

615. leg. ὑπ' [e Schol.]

623. leg. κηρύττω γε [sic MS.]

633. lege αἴτιος ὑμῖν: cf. 641. [Ita Dawes. p. 254.]

636. leg. ἀπὸ τῶν πόλων οἱ πρέσβεις [ita Porson. Praef. Hec. p. 48.]

638. fo. δι' ἰου στεφάνους.

655. leg. κωμωδεῖ vel—δῆ [ita Scaliger: at rectius Tyrwhitt. ἀφ' ἧ' ut edidit ELMsL.]

659. Suid. in Παλαμᾶσθαι habet πρὸς ταῦτ' ὃ, τι χρῆ et post αἰλῶ addit κατὰ πράσσω: nempe ex Tragico cujus haec est parodia.

664. leg. Λακκαταπύγων [sic MSS. 9.] Photius in Lex. Λακκατάρατοι, οἱ ἄγαν κατάρατοι καὶ Λακκαταπύγων, ἄγαν καταπύγων vid. Lys. 583. [ubi Bentl. λακκατάρατε pro παγκατάρατε.]

665. Schol. φλεγορέ.—670. lege ἡνίκ' ἄν. [sic MSS. 3.]
 671. ἀνακυκῶσι Suid. in *Θασίαν*.
 684. οὐδὲν ὁρῶντες Suid. in *Ἡλύγη*.
 690. Ex Schol. et Suid. in *Αὔξει* videtur olim fuisse εἶτ' ἀλύζει.
 706. lege κάπεμορξάμην, ἀπὸ τοῦ μόργνυμαι: alioqui deesset hic incrementum Aoristi. Hesych. Ἀπεμορξάμην ex hoc loco. Suid. in *Ἦστ'* ἰγὰρ habet κάπομ- et μοχ κυκώμενον: at κάπεμ- et κοιμώμενον in Ἀπεμορξάμην: sed MSS. ibi ut editum. [ἀπεμορξάμην Scaliger et Porson P. 1æf. Hec. p. 26.]
 710. lege μὲν τὸ πρῶτον vel μὲν γ' ἄν.
 Ibid. Inter Schol. post ὥσπερ additur Εὐαθλος e Suid. in *Εὐαθλοῖς* et Schol. ad Vesp. 590.
 730. leg. Ἐπόθευν.—731. leg. ἀθλίω [ita ELMSL.]
 733. Olim voluit Bentr. ποτέχετον omissio ἐμὴν [sic ELMSL.] postea Ἀκούετε δὴ. [et sic Hermann. de Metr. p. 153.]
 737. lege ὑμέ γα.
 738. Suid. Ἀλλα στὴν ἡμῖν Μεγάρικα: at ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν in *Μεγαρικαί*. lege Ἀλλ' ἐντι γ' ἀμὴν vel γὰρ ἐμὴν.
 739. Ald. φασῶ.
 741. δοξῇτ' omissio ἐξ Suid. in Σῦς et Τς. male.
 742. Ald. οἰκαδῖς. Vid. 779.—743. leg. λιμῶ. [ita ELMSL.]
 748. dele γε [sic Ræ.]
 754. lege vel Ἀλλα γ' vel Ἀλλ' ὄκα.
 758. ΔΙ. non agnoscit Ald. [neque MSS.]
 764. leg. χοίρωσ [ita ELMSL.]
 768. Frob. ποδαπήδ' ἥστί. lege vel ποδαπή δὴ ἔστι vel ποδάπ' ἥδ' ἐστί.
 772. dele νῦν et sic Suid. in *Θυμιτιάων* et *Περιοῦ* ubi *Θυμητιάων*.
 777. leg. χοίριον: vid. 740. [ita Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 239. et MS.]
 778. leg. σιγᾶς [e Schol.]—788. χοῖρος Athen. ix. p. 374.
 790. leg. ταυτῶ [ita Brunck.]—792. leg. ἔσται [ita MS. Rav.]
 798. leg. κὰν ἄνις γα: vid. 834.—799. fo. ἐσθίουσι.
 801. fo. ἐκῶν κοὶ κοί. vel τρώγεις ἐρεβίνθους αὐτὸς ἄν κοί.
 802. δι Suid. in *Φίβαλις*.
 803. Ald. δέ: mox “fo. αὐτόδ' :” at totum versum uncis circumdedit Bentr. [quia Suid. in *Φίβαλις* citat 802, et 804. omissio 803.]
 813. τροφαλλίδος Suid. in *Πόσου*: ut *τριπηλίδος* in sua serie.
 817. leg. ἐμαυτῶ [ita Brunck.]
 824. } dele { ME. } et leg. οἱ γοράνομοι. vid. 723 et 967. [Ita
 825. } ΔΙ. } Brunck.]
 833. fo. οὖν.—835. Hesych. et Phot. *Παίειν*—ἐσθίειν.
 836 et sqq. disponuntur in 4. systemata sex versuum.
 843. an νεικῶν [i. e. νεικῶν.]
 849. αἰ κακαρμένος Suid. in *Μοιχός*. sed forte legend. ἀνακακαρμένος.

851. fo. παχύς.
 855. leg. ἐν τῇ γοῇ [ita Brunck. vid. 728 et 848.]
 874. lege ψιάθως—κολοιῶς—τροχίθως κολύμβως [ita Brunck.]
 879. Ald. αἰελούρως.—883. [In Schol. χορὸν] fo. καῖαν.
 884. fo. κῆπαχάριτα vid. 867.—889. κρατίστην Athen. p. 299. B.
 891. Ald. τέν', alii τέκ': leg. τάν'.
 903. μή: leg. μὴ 'στί [ita Kuster.]
 907. leg. πολλᾶς [ita Brunck.]
 909. ἀλλὰ πᾶν κακὸν Suid. in Μικρός.—912. δαί: leg. δέ.
 916. Θρυαλλίδα Suid. in Θρυαλλίς.—917. fo. διὰ θρυαλλίδος.
 920. σίλφην Suid. in Θρυαλλίς: τίφην in Νεώρια. et sic Ald.
 [933. et sqq. disponuntur in systemata: quae commemorantur non est necesse: melius ELMSLEIUS carmen antistrophicum esse videt.]
 953. an ἰῶ [cui proxime accedit Ran. ἰών.]
 971. εἶδες ᾧ semel. Suid. in Ἀνθήρα.
 972. Suid. l. c. οἷον ἔχει σπεισάμενος: recte si legis ol' [et sic MS. B.]
 977. Inter Schol. φίλτατ' Ἀρμόδι: vid. Athen. p. 695.
 Ibid. τὸ δὲ λάμπωνος: leg. τ. δ. τελαμῶνος: vid. Lys. 1239. et Athen. l. c. at λάμπωνος Suid. in Οὐδίοις et in Πάροις: ubi tacet Kuster.
 985. τᾶδ' an δᾶδ'.
 990. ξυναγάγῃ Suid. in Ἀνθίμων—997. dele ἐν [sic ELMSL.]
 998. ἀλείφεισθαι Suid. in Νουμηνία, at ἀλείψασθαι in Ἀλείψας.
 999. Ed. Frob. λεῶ.
 1016. dele γε. Διᾶκονος 2da longa. Vid. Av. 73, 4. et 839.
 1020. fo. κὰν πέντετες [vid. 191.] Scal. κὰς πεντ' ἔτη.
 1021. Ald. ἐπετρίβειν. Scal. ἐπετρίβην.
 1023. τρισκακῶδαιμον Suid. in Ἀμπέχει.
 1024. fo. ᾧπερ [sic MSS.]
 1031. lege τοῦ πιττάλου: vid. 1220. et Vesp. 1423. Suid. τοῦ Σπιττάλου in Σπίτταλος.
 1052. ἀλάβαστον Suid. in Ἀλαβαστοθήκας.
 1077. leg. πλένες [sic ELMSL.]
 1090. στέφος Suid. in Ἰτρία.—1093. τάχος Suid. l. c.
 1098. οἷσε μοι Suid. in Περίδου.—1101. dele σύ.
 1124. γυρόνωντων Plutarch. [comparat. Aristoph. et Menand. p. 853. C.]
 1130. κελεύω] κελεύων B. [ita Bentl. at quid velit per istud B. nescio. scio tamen MSS. κελεύων habere.]
 1145. Olim sic "fo. σοὶ δ' αὖ," mox "δὲ longum ob ῥ sequens."
 [vid. ad Nub. 543.]

1149. forte ψακάδα [e Schol.] sed repugnat Suid. in 'Αντιμάχου, verum in Τευθίδης [et Ψίκας] habet ψικάδα.

Ibid. Inter Schol. καιρόν: lege χορόν e Suid. [ita Kuster.]

1150. dele τὸν αὐτὸ ποιήτην [sic MSS.]—1162. lege καὶ θάτερον.

1164. βαδίζει Suid. in 'Ηπιάδος. fo. βαδίζοι [ita ELMsL.] sed vid. Schol. ad v. 1181. [scil. nominativus est pendens.]

1178. Suid. Παλινόρον. lege παλινόρσον [ita ELMsL.] immo Παλίνωρον ex Hesychio.

1199. Ad Schol. verba Θηλυδριῶδες καὶ κατεγγλωττισμένον adscripsit Thesm. 138.

1200. lege καὶ τὸ μανδαλωτὸν αὖ. Suid. Μανδαλωτόν: [et sic ELMsL.] sed ut editum in Περιπεταστόν.

1203. ἰὼ ἰὼ] τῶν. at Suid. in Συμφορὰ ut editum.

1218. fo. κὰγώ γ' ὀπύειν.

1220. leg. τοῦ [sic Ran.] vid. ad 1031.

1224. ὀδυρτῇ Suid. in 'Οδύρτη.

1226. lege ὦ πρέσβυ [e Schol. sic Ran.]

1228. ὦ ἀγένναδα. dele α [sic Scaliger et MSS.]

Ibid. Inter Schol. "Vid. Schol. ad Av. 1762. et sic leg. Τήνελα. Ὡ καλλίνικε χαῖρ' ἀναξ' Ἡράκλειος Αὐτός τε χ' ἰολαος αἰχμητὰς ὤε. Vid. Schol. Pind. Ol. ix. 1." [ita ELMsL.]

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

De Vocibus Βλίτον, sive βλίτος, et βλιτομάμμα, dequæ Sensu primario vocum Μωρός, Μωραίνω, ' Fatuus, insulsus.

HESYCH. βλίτον λαχάιου είδος. Lex. Reg. Ms. ap. Albert. βλίτον είδος λαχάιου τινές δὲ βλίττον γράφουσιν. Ap. Suid. habemus, βλίτος· είδος βετάνης: nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. habet βλίτος, quod lexicographis est notandum: βλίτος autem esse i. q. βλίτον, e Latina lingua apparet: Pallad. in Mart. tit. 9. sub fin. *Hoc mense blitus seritur solo qualicunque, sed culto.*

Aristoph. Nub. 1001. Br. Τοῖς Ἰπποκράτους υἱοῖσιν εἴξεις, καὶ σε καλοῦσι Βλιτομάμμαν. Hermannus bene scribit βλιτομάμμαν, (quod Phrynichus Σοφ. Προπαρ. habet) et bene posteriorem hujus vocab. partem derivat, ut Phrynichus, a μάμμη, quod matrem significat: βλιτομάμματα· ἐπὶ ταν ἐκλελυμένων οἰᾷ τρυφῇ συγκεῖται μετὰ τὸ βλίτον, ὃ ἐστὶ λάχανον ἐκλυτον αἰουρόν τε δριμύτητος, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μάμμα, ὃ σημαίνει μητρη ἐξ οὗν τούτων συγκείμενον σημαίνει τὸν ἐπὶ μητρός τροφῇ ἐξίτηλον γὰρ ἴμειον. Quid sibi velit Phrynichus, parum intelligimus. "Inepta sunt," ut ait Brunckius, "quæ ad hoc verbum adnotat Schol. βλιτομαμμαν Perperam in meo Cod. βλιτομάμμαν: pejus ap. Suid. βλιτομαμμμαν (quare Br. Suidæ βλιτομάμμαν pejus esse dicat, non videt Herm.) Egrege fallitur H. Steph. *Ind.*, ubi *postulante metro potius legendum esse* ait καλ-σουσί τε σε βλιτ-μ-μαι: optime se habet Codd lectio: ultima in καλοῦσι, producitur ob sequentem mediam cum liquida. Βλιτομάμμαι derivatur a βλίτον, blitum, quod pleris genus est omnium insipidissimum et fatuum, unde insulsi et inutiles blitei appellantur. Plaut. Truc. iv. 4. 1. *Blitea et lutea est meretrix, nisi quæ sapit in vino ad rem suam.* Gallos vocem suam, qua socordes inertesque homines blittres, belittres, appellant, hinc deduxisse, viris quibusdam eruditis creditum fuit. Sed verisimilius affertur etymon."

Doctissimus Brunckius verba Schol. quæ exscripsit Suidas, non intellexit: βλιτομάμμαν μωρόν, τὸ γὰρ βλίτον μωρόν εἶναι δοκεῖ λάχανον: immo adeo non sunt "inepta quæ ad h. v. adnotat Schol.," ut Brunckius ipse cum Scholiasta idem sentiat: nam quod Schol. appellat μωρόν λάχανον, id Brunckius vocat *insipidissimum et fatuum*. Μωρόν enim proprie notat *id quod est insipidum, vel fatuum, i. e. sine sapore*. Lexicographi hanc propriam vim vocis minus perceperunt. H. Steph. Th. Gr. L. T. ii. p. 1664, D., qui hunc sensum non, ut debuerat, primarium fecit: "Μωρός," inquit, "cujus gus-

tus est fatuus, sive insipidus, Diosc. iv. ῥίζαι γευσάμεναι μωραί, ubi quidam interpr. *radices gustu fatuo*; quidam, *radices sapore insipido*." Iterum de verbo *μωραίνεσθαι*, p. 1666. C. "Pro *infatuari*, i. e. *fatuum*, seu *insipidum reddi*: ap. Matth. v. εἰν δὲ τὸ ἄλλας μωρανθῆναι, ἐν τινὶ ἀλισθῆται; ubi vet. interpr. vertit, *Si sal evanuerit, in quo salietur?* Alii autem reddunt, *Si sal infatuatus fuerit: redditur etiam, si desipuerit*, item, *si insipidus factus fuerit*. Illud certe verbum *infatuatus* significatione convenit: si modo ap. Martialem (xiii. 13.) *betas fatuas* exponere possumus *insipidas*: Marcus pro *μωρανθῆναι* habet ἀναλὸν γένεσθαι: sequitur autem hoc *μωραίνεσθαι* eam nominis *μωρός* significationem, qua pro *fatuo*, seu *insipido* usurpari a Dioscoride, paulo ante docui." Galenus Expl. Vocc. Hippocr. *Μωρωμέναι τὰ ἀναίσθητα*, ubi Franzius refert ad *Prorrh.* p. 197. 53. et *Couc. Præn.* p. 429. 15. Non debuerat H. Steph. de vi τοῦ *fatuus*, i. e. *insipidas*, ap. Martialem dubitare, nam Martialis sæpe vocabulo sic utitur: xiii. 10. "Ut *sapient fatuæ* fabrorum prandia betæ, O quam sæpe petet vina piperque coquæ!" X. 37. "Et *fatuam* summa cœnare pelorida mensa." XI. 32. "Hinc pistor *fatuas* facit placentas." Forcellinus, qui, ut nobis videtur, minus recte judicat "*fatuum* translate dici de cibis, qui insipidi sunt," et qui, ut Gesnerus quoque facit, unum tantum Martialis locum adducit, sc. eum, in quo occurrunt verba *fatuæ betæ*, bene scribit: "Fortasse huc pertinet illud Varronis ap. Non. IV. n. 291. Quod Cal. Jun. et publice, et privatim *fatuam pultem* tile mactat, h. e. *sine sale*, et fortasse intelligit libum ex farre, et faba, quod eo ipso die Carnæ deæ offerri solitum, tradit Ovid. VI. *Fast.* 170." Servius in Virg. *Georg.* iii. 395. "Ipsam lac non vit *fatuum*, sed habeat salis occultum *saporem*," notante Wetstenio ad loc. Matth.

Ut *fatuus* et pro *insipido* et pro *stulto* usurpatur, ita quoque *insulsus*, de quo Non. Marc. p. 501. (Gothofredi Auctt. L.L. ed. 1682) "*Insulsum*, proprie *fatuum*, sine sale: M. T. ad Cæsarem Juniorem Epist. ii. *Sed ita locutus insulse est, ut mirum Senatûs convivium exceperit*, et de Oratore II. (257. c. 54.), *Sed qui ejus rei rationem quandam conati sunt, artemque tradere, sic insulsi exstiterunt, ut nihil aliud eorum, nisi ipsa insulsitas irrideatur*. Ad etymologiam vocis alludit Quinctil. *Inst.* VI. 3., cum scribit: *Salsum igitur erit, quod non erit insulsum: velut quoddam simplex orationis condimentum, quod sentitur latente judicio velut palato, etcitaturque et a tedio defendit orationem*.

"*Μωραίνω*," ut ait Schleusnerus, "proprie de rebus usurpatur, et significat *fatuum, insipidum reddo, corrumpto*: passiv. *μωραίνωμαι, fatuus, et insipidus fio, corrumpor, vim et vigorem amitto, a μωρός, fatuus, insipidus*: ita dicitur de *sale* Matth. V. 13. Cf. Wetzelii *Exercitat. Medico-philol. Decad. V. Exerc. 4.* p. 15. J. H.

Maii Obs. ss. III. p. 105." Iterum: "Μωρός, ut *fatuus* Martial. XIII. 13. *insipidus*, qui saporem, ~~et~~ et vigorem amisit, Hippocr. de Dieta II. 27. Text. 2. Dioscor. IV. 18. p. 122.; deinde, ut Hebr. מֵרֵךְ (quod pr. *insulsum*, *insipidum*, Job. vi. 6. deinde vero *stultum* notat, v. c. *Thren.* ii. 4.) Lat. *fatuus*, Gallic. *fade*, et nostrum *abgeschmackt*—q. μῆ, *non*, et ὥρα, *cura*, qui nullius rei cura tangitur, vel quasi μὴ ὁρῶν, *non videns*, sc. *animo*, *non intelligens*." Mirum sane, Schleusnerum, doctissimum simul et acutissimum, qui tam bene de sensu primario hujus vocis præcepit, vulgarem sequi etymologiam, quæ huic primario sensui parum convenit. Nec hæc etymologia, nec altera ap. Eustath., qui vult μωρός dictum esse quasi μήρορ, H. Stephano satis placet. Tertiam etymologiam affert Schneiderus in Lex.: μάρω, μαράω, μαραινῶ: sic μῶλυς, μωλυρός contr. μωρός: ap. Hippocr. *Epid.* i. p. 364. μωλούμενα sunt κατὰ βραχὺ ἀπομαραινόμενα, ut Galenus vocem explanat: sed hæc etymologia nobis non placet, nec varii sensus vocum μωρός, et μῶλυς (i. e. *tardus*, *hebes*, *indoctus*) inter se congruere videntur. Μωρόν esse *insipidum* ap. Hippocr., notavit J. C. Schwarzzius *Comment. crit. et philol. L. Gr. N. F.* Lips. 1737. p. 991., et post eum Schleusnerus. Jam vero si *fatuus* et *insulsus* ap. Latīnōν, et מֵרֵךְ ap. Hebræos usurpentur et pro *insipido*, et pro *stulto*, quid mirum μωρόν eundem duplicem sensum ap. Græcos habere? et si propria notione *fatuus*, et *insulsus*, et מֵרֵךְ pro eo, quod est *sine sapore*, sumantur, quare dubitemus eundem primarium Gr. verbo μωρός tribuere sensum, non videmus, præsertim cum e sensu *insipidi* facili transitu perveniamus ad sensum *stulti*.

Hermannō βλιτομάμμα est "is qui, infantis instar, matrem perpetuo vocantis, simplex et stolidus est: similiter μαμμάκυβοι Ran. 990."

Thetford, Oct. 6th, 1815.

E. H. BARKER.

AN ANSWER TO
A LATE BOOK

*Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley,
relating to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus.*

TOGETHER WITH AN EXAMINATION OF MR. BENNET'S
APPENDIX TO THE SAID BOOK.

LONDON: PRINTED IN THE YEAR, 1690.

No. VI.—*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 145.*

*To the Author of the Remarks upon Dr. Bentley's Fragments
of Callimachus.*

AND that Supplement of yours must not be passed over in silence. Then might you call me a partial writer indeed, if I took no notice of your supplement. This supplement of yours you have set forth in a place by itself; and, the more effectually to draw the reader's eye upon it, marked it out into thirteen capital figures. You introduce it thus.

V. I expected, when I looked on the last beautiful edition of Callimachus, to have found every little passage of the ancient writers, wherein but his name was mentioned, gathered to my hands by Dr. Bentley.

W. Then you could not but have expected to have found in Dr. Bentley all those quotations out of the ancient writers which are in Mr. Stanley's MS. whether ever he had seen that MS. or not. 'Tis fate; the Dr. shall be acquitted by the same mouth that accuses him.

V. But I have met with a few, which, I presume, he either had not seen or forgotten.

W. A few.

V. And because I am persuaded it will not disserve the learned world, I shall insert them.

W. Sc. By way of supplement to the former editions of Callimachus. For otherwise, what service could it be to the learned world? And so you explain yourself when upon Num. 12. you expressly say (p. 49.) that that epigram, Quænam hæc forma Dei, &c. was (you thought) omitted in the late edition. Here therefore we may expect to see the whole of your reading, and what services the learned world may procure itself from your pen. I shall take them one by one in order as they lie.

Num. 1. Suidas v. Κωλαίς, Ναός ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, &c. formerly cited at length.

W. *Supra*.

V. Num. 2. v. *Κωμῆται. Κωμῆται καὶ οἱ γελοῖοι, &c.* in the same page.

W. In the same page.

V. *Κάππα* Mr. B. p. 245.

W. *Κάππα supra*.

V. Num. 3. Natalis Comes's citation out of Callimachus's Hecate, accounted for already.

W. I'll have nothing to do with Natalis Comes.

But why should I be so angry, will you ask me, with Natalis Comes? [p. 50, 51.] That Italian critick was a famous man in his generation, and had read nobody knows how many MSS. [p. 45.]

I'll tell you, Sir: there was a certain Italian critick, a man of vast learning indeed, but withal so horrible unmannerly, that the world hated and despised him at the same time that it was profiting by him; one Joseph Scaliger. [v. Mr. B. p. 225. confer cum Dr. B's *Ans. Præf.* p. 100.] And he hath given me such an idea of this Italian critick of yours, that makes me apt (at first sight) to think the worse of any book (yours I except) wherein I do but meet with so much as the name of this Natalis Comes. 'Tis in one of his letters to Sethus Calvisius, where he tells that great astronomer with what satisfaction all men of learning received that excellent book, his chronology. [Scaliger Ep. 309.] Upon which he immediately addeth. Qui unum, ac cum illis ego, à te peunt, ut scriptorum quorundam minorum gentium mentione, qualis est Natalis Comes, homo futilissimus, abstinere. Dolet enim magnis viris illos pannos tuæ purpuræ assui: Tu hæc in secundâ editione curabis. That it grieved all men of learning to see the name of so wretched a trifler as Natalis Comes standing in so excellent a book as Calvisius his chronology, and therefore Scaliger begs of him, that in the next edition he would strike him out: which accordingly was done. This passage of Scaliger, Mausacus, in his dissert. critic. (referr'd to more than once before) repeats, and expresses himself even to a passion upon it. It raised an indignation in him, that there should be found men in the world so weak as to pretend to establish any thing upon the credit of such beggarly scribblers as Natalis Comes, and set up for criticks and authors by stuffing out their books with such borrowed authorities. So that whether the Dr. had never seen this passage in Natalis Comes, or whether he had forgotten it, or whether (which is more likely) he neglected it, I am not able to determine: but that this Natalis Comes is an author with whom you are extremely well acquainted, is a plain case. There's not any one name in your whole book comes so often over as Natalis Comes. Dr. Bentley takes his Fragment, n. 110. from the *Ety-mologicon* (Nicas some call him — turn to it, reader, in the vindicator's book, p. 43, 44. 'Tis a learned parenthesis) but Natalis Comes had published a larger fragment: Dr. Bentley takes after Casaubon's lection; [p. 45.] but Natalis Comes gives them more correct, and translates them better: and who knows what MSS. Natalis Comes may have seen? [p. 50.] Natalis Comes gives another epigram too as from Callimachus, and though I know not, whether that Italian author was critick enough to determine the controversie; [what controversie?] yet Dr. Ben-

they might have been so fair as to have mentioned him. Natalis Comes hath given us a handsome commentary upon the fragment, n. 209. int. Bentleyan. [p. 71.] But Dr. Bentley transcribes it (and that but abruptly) from the Scholiast upon Sophocles: and that book indeed, the Scholiast upon Sophocles, the Dr. had consulted: but as for Natalis Comes, one knows not whether Dr. Bentley hath ever so much as seen that Italian critick. And here again, Num. 3. we have Natalis Comes: and Num. 11. Natalis Comes again. And may not a man say of this Natalis, your darling author: this Natalis Comes, Sir, is an erranter pedant than Dion Chrysostom himself. [Mr. B. p. 26. confer cum Dr. B.'s Answ. p. 5, 6.] But,

Pro capto lectoris habent sua fata libelli.

The sense of which words I find happily alluded to in a late excellent poem.

But each vile Scribler's happy on this score,

He'll find some Draucus still to read him o'er. [Dispensary.]

After Natalis Comes, your next darling author is Lactantius Placidus. In p. 36. we have had Lactantius, or (as you well observe) Lutatius Placidus; in p. 38, 39. You have run on score with the same Lactantius Placidus for a considerable parcel of mistakes of the first size. [Supr.] Here Num. 4. you are in with your Lactantius again, and Num. 9. you will even account with him, making as many mistakes, and as foul ones upon Lactantius, as Lactantius had before made for you.

V. Num. 4. Lactantius Placidus, &c.

W. Enjoy it. The other three you are beholden to your MS. for. For though I doubt not, but that Mr. Stanley had read all Suidas over, yet for Mr. Stanley's vindicator I cannot make out the like evidence. Lactantius Placidus is a critick so stooping towards your height, that I am apt to believe you may have read him. And therefore this Num. 4. (though I think I could dispossess you of it) yet I am willing to let pass for your own.

But here (as you cannot forbear him) you occasionally bring in another remark upon the Dr. which should indeed have been referred to the class of Transportations, supr.

V. To that book of Callimachus, entitled, *Κτίσεις Νήσων καὶ πόλεων, καὶ μετωνομασίαι*; that is, the foundation of cities and Islands, and the change of their names; I would also refer all those passages in Pliny, cited by Dr. Bentley, n. 392, 393, 394, 395, 397. in which there is an express mention of the change of the names of those places. [p. 82.]

W. In not one of these passages out of Pliny is there any such express mention. There is indeed express mention of the names of several places and people, and sometimes of several names of the same places: but not of the *μετωνομασία*, the change of those names. That which comes the nearest to your purpose, is n. 397. *Εἰς (Samothracen) Callimachus antiquo nomine Dardanium vocat.* But to have answer'd your design, it should have been, *antiquo nomine (or rather antiquitus) Dardanium vocatam (fuisse) tradit.* Express mention, you say, of the change of those names. But, pray, Sir, what express mention of the change of the names do you find in this fragment, n. 393. *inter Corcyram et Illyricum Melita; unde catulos Melitæos appellari*

Callimachus auctor est. Here is, you say, express mention of the change of the names. Were the Melitæi therefore formerly called Catuli, or the Catuli, Melitæi? For the one or the other of these you must mean. There were, Sir, of old a certain race of lap-dogs called Catuli Melitæi; and this name, saith Callimachus, was given them from the island Melita; that is, from this island Melita lying near Coreyra (Corfu:) not that other island of the same name lying near Sicily, now called Malta. And this is all that Pliny means. But by one dash of your pen are a whole nation of islanders metamorphosed into a breed of lap-dogs. A man that was minded to deal less tenderly with you than I am, would not have parted with this choice piece of lap-dog criticism for two or three pages together. But I cannot imagine you to be so wretchedly ignorant, as to have taken the Catuli Melitæi for a people. [Mr. B. p. 45.] No, certainly, Sir, you are a greater scholar than so. This was put down only to carry on the humour of contradicting Dr. Bentley. But as you have got nothing by it hitherto, let me advise you to give it over.

V. I am of opinion that the fragment n. 399. may belong to Callimachus the statuary. [p. 83.]

W. Here you are at it again; Dr. Bentley must be corrected. There can no other reason in the world be given for any man's being of that opinion, but because that fragment relates to a statue. Pliny tells us a story of a certain person, that had, during his life-time two statues, erected to him, both of which statues, though standing in places far distant the one from the other (the one in Italy, the other in Greece) were struck with lightning on the same day. This, saith Pliny, Callimachus looked upon as next to a prodigy. And might not Callimachus the poet wonder at so strange an accident as well as Callimachus the statuary? But however this serves to expose the Dr. who (with Harduin) was so injudicious as to refer this passage to Callimachus the poet.

V. Num. 5. A quotation out of Diomedes Grammaticus.

Num. 6. The like out of Atil. Fortunatianus de Priapeio metro.

W. The only discovery with which you have in these two numbers obliged the learned world is, that as among the Romans, Propertius, Tibullus, and Gallus wrote in elegiac versè: so before them did Callimachus and Euphorion among the Greeks. And that Callimachus in his epigrams had, as to the choice of his metre, some peculiarities of his own ('tis not said what) as had also Bacchilides, and some other poets, theirs. And this is one of those discoveries omitted by Dr. Bentley; [p. 49.] the bringing of which to light, you are persuaded is no disservice to the learned world. Certainly so, Sir, no disservice. Your quotation of Atil. Fortunatianus is out of Putschius his Grammatici Veteres, p. 2676. In the Dr.'s answer to your honourable patron, p. 227. I find him within three pages of you in the same Atil. Fortunatianus, sc. on p. 2679. de Saturnio versu. Which passage in the Dr. with the occasion of his producing it, p. 226. I recommend to the perusal of the inquisitive reader. So lucky are you all along in your memorandums, though I take notice of but few of them.

V. Num. 7. Atilius Fortunatianus, p. 268^o. de Saturnio versu.

W. Much to the same purpose as the two former, only with this difference, that as in them you did no disservice to the learned world, so in this you do no service: this very passage being printed in Grævius's *Callimachus*, and placed by Spanheim, where it should be, amongst the *Testimonia*, p. 302.

V. Num. 8. A quotation out of Cæcilius Minutianus Apuleius from Cælius Rhodiginus.

W. In the fore-mentioned Salvagnius Boessius his *Prolegomena*, p. 16. which our vindicator, without naming his benefactor, hath confidently made his own. But those prolegomena of Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read, and therefore cannot but have seen this quotation. [Supra.] 'Tis a known story, and produced by the Dr. over and over, (p. 345.) and that from far more certain authorities than that unknown Cæcil. Minutianus Apuleius, upon whom Salvagnius sets this mark; *Quinondum lucem vidit, unique Cælio Rhodigino notus fuit.*

V. Num. 9. Lactantius Placidus.

Your darling author Lactantius Placidus. There was no occasion in the world for your exposing your self here. In the first place you do not contradict Dr. Bentley. In the next, when you were only making a supplement to Callimachus, you should have let those things alone which were already done to your hand. The passage here produced is printed with a large commentary upon it, by Spanheim in his volume of learned observations upon this author, p. 571, 572. And a little modesty might have taught you not to have meddled with a subject before exhausted by so masterly a pen. But to do you justice, I verily believe, you did not know of Mr. Spanheim's having said any thing to it.

V. Were I allow'd to play the bold critick, I would for Arcades read *Argivi*, (for Tydeus, the father of Diomedes — —. [p. 86.]

W. Bold critick! Most properly spoken, and since 'tis an epithet of your own chusing, may it be your character: the bold critick. Such a number of gross absurdities crowded into the compass of so few lines (one short parenthesis) I defy any man to show me in any book in the whole world again. And they are all your own: not one of them here, as before in the case of Brauchades Apollo, borrowed from Lactantius Placidus. [Supr.] In the first place, Sir, *spolium* signifies the spoils (as the armour, and badges of honour) taken from off the body of an enemy slain in open fight; as in *Vigil, Actoris Aurunci Spolium*; and not the armour worn by a man while living. So that according to your correction of the poet, this Diomedes the son of Tydeus must have been (as indeed afterward he was) a famous warrior, must have perform'd all his exploits, must have been slain in the wars; and all this long before he was born; nay, he must, after he was slain, and before he was begotten, have danc'd in armour at his father's wedding. For 2ndly, Sir, if you had took time to look into the author upon whom you were commenting, you would have found that these words were timed at Tydeus his marriage with the mother of Diomedes. And 3dly, if you had look'd into any of your poetical dictionaries, you would have found

that there were two Diomedes, that is, Diomedes the Thracian, slain by Hercules, and this Argian Diomedes the son of Tydens; and that 'twas the Thracian Diomedes, who was so famous for his man-eating, chimney-no'd horses. [Impius humano viscere pavit equos, Ovid. Et Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem, Lucret.] And consequent from these premises you will find; 1st, That your Argos *ἰσχυρός* is nothing at all to the purpose. 2ndly, That Euhippus was substantial flesh and blood, and not a mere noun adjective. And 3dly, From hence may the reader take this information, that a book may have a great many Greek and Latin words in it, and bear a mighty show of learning, though written by a man that understands nothing of the matter he is writing upon; and withal, that some of the pages written against Dr. Bentley are of this kind.

V. Manuscript—p. 87.

W. Stuff!

V. Num. 10. A quotation out of Photius.

W. A bare mention of the name of Callimachus with something of a censure pass'd upon him with several other writers in a lump.

V. Num. 11. A choice epigram out of Natalis Comes.

W. I'll have nothing to do with Natalis Comes.

V. Num. 12. An Epigram out of the collection of the epigrammata veterum with this title.

Callimachi

Imagini inscriptum Jovis.

Quænam hæc forma Dei? cur versa est? Fulgura lucis

Divinæ non fert debilis hæc acies, &c.

Which epigram, (p. 49.) if I am not mistaken, the late editors of Callimachus have not mentioned.

W. You are mistaken, Sir. 'Tis in both the last edition of Grævius's, and in the edition last before that of Dacier; in both of them inter testimonia veterum. Oh shamefull! Not so much as turn'd over the very first leaves of the book you were making your comments upon!

V. Num. 13. A citation out of Malela.

W. Omitted by the Dr. (I confidently presume) for the same reason, as were those out of Natalis Comes.

V. The learned editor of that historian for Etesiiis reads Αἴτιis.

W. The learned editor of that historian saith not a word of the matter.

V. Perhaps it should be ἀγῶσιν.

W. An easie correction of Ἐρησίους into ἀγῶσιν. For there be two of the same letters in both words, σ. ι. And, besides what have the Etesian winds to do with the racing-chariots? Did those chariots go with sails? vide loc. Malel. p. 221.

V. Callimachus wrote of winds, and therefore perhaps the true reading is in the text, and should be translated de Etesiiis.

W. What need therefore of such a forced correction. *περὶ ἀνέμων* we know Callimachus wrote, but I never yet heard of any book of his entitled, Ἐρησία.

V. And 'tis not altogether improbable, (but) that Suidas might mention his Αἴρια, if a small correction be allowed, and instead of *τῶν δὲ*

πρὸς βιβλίον ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦτα, we read ἐστὶ καὶ Αἴτια, 'Ιοῦς' Ἀφίξις, &c. But this opinion wants the countenance of a manuscript.

W. There was no manner of occasion for this learning of yours in this place. You'll never meet with any such thing in a MS. Or if you do, I'll venture to tell you before-hand, that MS. is faulty. He that hath the least gust of the Greek language will tell you, that the καὶ and the ταῦτα cannot here be parted. But somewhat you must be a doing. A critick without his corrections, editions, and MSS. is like a Beau without his wig, vide Mr. B. p. 146. ΠΩΤΗΡΙΩΝ ΘΗΡΑΚΑΕΙΩΝ, and Dr. R.'s answer, p. 113.

And here ends your supplement, upon which let us now cast up accounts, and see how deeply the learned world stands indebted to you.

This collection of yours, as you call it, consists of thirteen capital figures; [p. 88.] of which Num. 1, 2. transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. are somewhat to the purpose, and will, 'tis likely, be inserted in the next impression of Callimachus. 3, 7, 9, 12. printed in the last edition. 4, 5, 6, 10. a bare mention of the name of Callimachus. The epigram of 11. no more Callimachus's than your own. 8, 13. the substance of them both in the Dr.'s collection over and over. But as for those indifferent names which you have tack'd to them, Dr. Bentley scorn'd to make use of such authorities. So that, Sir, not to flatter you, the service you have done to the learned world by presenting it with this your supplement is just none at all: or the very utmost you can pretend to, is the having transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. the two quotations out of Suidas. But as for those usefull and accurate observations which you have added, as that of the Catuli Melitæi, and Diomedes's his armour, they are purely your own. And if Mr. Grævius, or any one else shall think fit to insert them in the next impression of Callimachus's Works, 'tis pity but that the world should be inform'd to whom it is obliged for them. [p. 74.] In the mean time, I have not been wanting in my endeavours to blazon your atchievements, and make the learned world take notice of them.

I have now performed all that, as far as you are concerned in it, my title page promises. For upon the former part of your book I had once designed a separate consideration. But I am weary of my work, and, I fansie, both your self and the reader think it high time for me to have done with you. Yet since it might look somewhat suspiciously to take no manner of notice of it, I shall, with all the brevity imaginable, bestow upon it a cursory reflection or two.

That former part of your book contains in it a most grievous accusation. Dr. Bentley's injustice and inhumanity to those authors who have written before him. Upon which I cannot but in the first place observe to the reader, that had one designed to have written a panegyrick upon the Dr., one could not have pitch'd upon a more proper subject for it, than what this man makes choice of for matter of reproach against him: all this injustice and inhumanity of the Dr. to those authors who have written before him terminating in this point; that Dr. Bentley hath observed some mistakes that have drop'd from the pens of several great men, who have written before him, and corrected them: a service for which he hath received the publick acknowledgment of per-

sons altogether as considerable in the commonwealth of learning, as any of the retainers to the half-moon club. But if the Dr. doth (as indeed he pretty often doth) disagree from the opinions of those great men, who have written before him, it is, though sometimes with the assurance of a man that knows what he is speaking of, yet always, with a due respect and deference to the worth of the persons from whom he dissents. But let us proceed to particulars.

V. Dr. Bentley calls *Æmilius Portus*, *hominum futilissimum*, the greatest of Triflers, ep. ad fin. *Mal.* p. 51. [p. 7.]

W. *Æmilius Portus* was but a puny critick, and to persons of his character there is no epithet oft'ner apply'd, than that of *futilissimus*. We have had it once before, *supr.* [Vide quæ de *Æmilio Porto Pearsonus* in *Prolegom. ad Hierocl. Æmilium Portus*, qui *Suidam* adeo infelicitè transtulit, &c.]

V. Nor can Gerard Vossius, and Johnsius escape being treated by him with the like language. [*Ibid.*]

W. 'Tis a most notorious falshood.

V. Who suffer'd themselves to be led into an error through their ignorance. [*Ibid.*]

W. In errorem inscii inciderant, *D. B.* ep. p. 51. The word *inscii*, here is to be translated unwarily, incogitantly, not ignorantly. And but that these great men were guilty of a strange incogitancy as to the matter the Dr. was speaking of, is a thing which cannot be deny'd, *vide locum*. You must learn to construe a piece of Latin, before you write another book against Dr. Bentley.

V. The same most learned Vossius he severely arraigns in another place of committing a great mistake without consideration and judgment. [*Ibid.*]

W. You misconstrue the Dr. again, and turn his words to a sense directly contrary to what they intend, *Dr. B.* ep. p. 83. *non certo judicio, sed inconsideratè, præterque morem egisse videtur*. The sense of the Dr.'s words is plainly this, that though Vossius had written the name *Malela* without an *s*, yet 'twas not his *certum judicium*, not his own judgment, or his own standing opinion, that it ought always to be so written; for that his own practice contradicted: but he wrote it so, *inconsideratè, præterque morem*, inaccurately, incuriously, or (if you will have it so) *inconsiderately; præterque morem*, and contrary to his usual practice. For the whole stress of the Dr.'s argument is, that it was not Vossius's his standing opinion, that the name *Malela* ought to be written without an *s*, and consequently, that his writing it so, could not be through ignorance, or mistake, or for want of judgment; but purely either through inadvertency, or rather with a contented unexactness in compliance with some other authors who had used that way of writing it. So that you here charge the Dr. with charging Vossius with want of judgment, when the Dr. is arguing directly the contrary, and discharging him from that suspicion. Here's justice and judgment joyn'd together!

V. He speaks of the most learned man of the later Greeks, *Leo Allatius*, as if he were [a brute] not so much a man, as a composition of ill-nature and envy. [p. 8.]

W. The flourish of [a brüte] is of your own making. The Dr. allows him the title of eruditissimus, ep. p. 50. As for the other part of his character, ep. p. 51. See how, after Bochart, the learned Dr. Th. Smith speaks of Leo Allatius in his *Narratio de vitâ*, &c. Cyrilli Lucarii; as in many other places, so particularly, p. 113. Leo Allatius—suspectæ fidei testis, et ad convitiandum propensissimus. An unlucky quality, Sir, especially where there's no good one (which was not Allatius's case) to counterbalance for it.

V. He endeavours to prove Erasmus, Scaliger, and Grotius, men of no palate in matters of learning; or fools. [Ibid.]

W. A most notorious fal-hood.

V. And accuses them of a most foul error.

W. But 'tis a most foul error in you to say so. He accuses not them of a most foul error, but the copies of Plutarch of a very faulty lection, which he wonders indeed none of those great men should have observed. Here follows your own correction of the Dr.'s correction. 'Tis like all the other things that are your own. You don't understand what the Dr.'s at, Sir, *Μουσικὸν διδάσκει*. The Dr.'s criticism runs more upon the *διδάσκει* than the *Μουσικόν*. And therefore your marginal learning is (like every thing else you write) nothing to the purpose.

V. He allows not Florus Christianus, Scaliger, or any other of the moderns to have understood the true measures of an anapestick verse. [p. 9.]

W. Of which presumption Mr. Boyle long before your self had accused the Dr. and in a much livelier manner; and before your book came out had received the Dr.'s answer to it. Mr. B. p. 159. Dr. B's answer, p. 132. et seqq. Is not the republishing baffled objections without taking a syllable notice of the answer which had been before given to them, a piece of impertinence?

V. He speaks very coarsely of Lilius Gyraldus, and Monsieur Menage. [p. 10.]

W. 'Tis false. He never speaks of them otherwise than very respectfully.

V. He takes occasion frequently to quarrel with, and correct Isaac Casaubon. [Ibid.]

W. That he quarrels with Isaac Casaubon is falsely spoken. 'Tis true, Dr. Bentley hath observed that great man to have made (as the greatest of men have done) some mistakes; and some of them he takes occasion to correct; but this is not quarrelling with him. Dr. Bentley admires Isaac Casaubon, and never speaks of him but in terms of respect.

V. He censures the commentators upon Pliny. [Ibid.]

W. The worst you can make of his censure upon the commentators upon Pliny is, that they were learned men, but not omniscient. He takes notice of a particular passage in that author of which the commentators had fail'd to give a right explication, but saith he, *εἰς ἀνθρώπου οὐ πάντες ὁρᾷ*, No man seeth all things. A severe censure!

V. He condemns Meursius of Ignorance. [Ibid.]

W. 'Tis false. The Dr. hath indeed, p. 40. these words concerning Meursius, *Horum versuum ignoratione totâ viâ erravit Joannes Meur-*

sius. The meaning of which is this: Julius Pollux, l. 7. c. 33. produces upon a certain occasion the authority of that ancient comic poet Eubulus, and gives it in Eubulus his own words. That quotation being written in Iambic verse (a sort of metre next to prose) and having nothing in it of a poetical air (as containing only a catalogue of names) and standing in Pollux continued with the rest of the text; Meursius mistakes it for the words of Pollux himself, and not of the author whose name Pollux cites to it: and horum versuum ignoratione, mistaking this quotation for prose, whereas indeed it was verse; and taking it for the words of Pollux, whereas they were indeed Eubulus's; upon this mistake, totâ viâ erravit, he was quite out in his explication of that passage. But that, Sir, was a mistake (as any one that shall consult the place will see) more easily committed than corrected. And Dr. Bentley's taking notice of it was no condemning Meursius of ignorance. Shew me where in any of his writings, Dr. Bentley calls Meursius an ignorant man, and I'll retract every word I have spoken on his behalf. Sir, I must tell you again, that before you write any more critical books, you must understand Latin a little better, and learn to translate properly.

V. He condemns Quintilian too: [Ibid.] as if Quintilian did not know the true reading of a word in Cicero, as well as Dr. Bentley. But I thought Quintilian a creditable authority.

W. Credible, Sir, you mean. But I have mended your form for you upon this article. What you speak of is this passage in Tully, De inventione, hujus constitutionis Hermagoras inventor esse existimatur. And ibid. Quòd si magnam in his Hermagoras habuisset facultatem. In both these places Quintilian reads it Hermagora. I dare say, the ingenious Mr. Boyle, who, 'tis plain, by his stile, hath a musical ear; after all which (rather than lose a flourish) he hath said upon the matter, is on the Dr.'s side against Quintilian. With the Dr. stand all the MSS. and so would any man that hath aures non asininas. But I believe, as to this affair, you are sincere, and do think the Dr. too presumptuous.

V. Nay, the Dr. saith, that though Tully himself should affirm he had written so; yet the Dr. would not believe Tully himself. No, Dr. Bentley would not submit to Tully himself. Tully the master of eloquence and standard of good language.

W. 'Tis true the Dr. doth say, (p. 80.) Ego verò Ciceronem ità scripsisse ne ipsi quidem Ciceroni affirmanti crediderim. Bold words, I confess. But, Sir, you must allow the Dr. to rhetoricate now and then. I have known a whole book, as large as yours and mine put together, made up of nothing but rhetorications; and yet it took very well and turn'd to better account to the bookseller, than the best that ever he printed.

V. He calls Malela a mule. [p. 11.]

W. Nay the Dr. is very rude to Malela, that's the truth on't. [V. D. D. H. Hodii, Prolegom. in Malel.] Make a collection, Sir, of the Dr.'s complements upon his author Malela, and print them by way of a second appendix to the next edition of your book. You'll expose him most terribly. Amabo te, Syriace; seriòne hæc an joco? Quæ te enim larvæ atque intemperiæ agitabant cum hæc

scriberes? ποὶ τοὶ φρόνες ἐκπετόνται; Muli sunt ista, non homini—
 O's hominis! Oh hominis stuporem! ah ista pecude, &c. These are
 the Dr.'s civilities to the author of the foregoing papers. But as for
 your own civilities, Sir, in the following part of the same page (11.) I
 leave them to be fairly divided between yourself and your friends.

V. He indites and arraigns the reverend Justin Martyr, Clemens
 Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Theodoret, and Athenagoras of forgery. [p.
 17, 16.]

W. 'Tis a most notorious falshood.

V. He flies higher and brings the rational and learned St. Paul under
 his pounces. [p. 17.]

W. Very clumsily express'd, Sir. Dr. Bentley is not the first man
 that hath offered at a conjectural emendation of the text of the New
 Testament. I hope, Sir, though you talk so much of Scripture, Fa-
 thers, and Councils; yet you are no clergyman. I should be very sorry
 to hear, that a man who takes such delight in reviling his betters be-
 longs to the gown.

V. He falls foul upon his most beloved friend Dr. Hody, exposing
 his exposition of the Orphic Ericapæus with an air peculiar to himself.
 [p. 23.]

W. The reverend and learned Dr. Hody is Dr. Bentley's most be-
 loved friend. Amicissimus noster atque eruditissimus Hodius are the
 Dr.'s own words, ep. p. 1. to which he adds p. 93. cui multum olim de-
 bebant historia Ecclesiastica.

But what a strange thing is this! That a man should set up for a
 critick and censor of other men's works, without having ever read so
 much as the very title-page of the book upon which he is making his
 reflections. Sir, if you had but read so much as the title-page to Ma-
 lela's chronology (as 'tis very plain Latin, I believe you could have con-
 strued it) you would have found, that Dr. Hody was no more concern-
 ed in this exposition of the Orphic Ericapæus than your self. The
 title-page of that book bears, JOANNIS ANTIOCHENI, &c. cum inter-
 pret. et Notis EDM. CHILMEADI—Præmittitur dissertatio de autore
 per HUMFREDUM HODIUM. Dr. Hody, you see, Sir, was neither the
 interpreter nor commentator upon that book, but only the editor, and
 writer of the dissertation concerning the author. And yet this same
 most horrible blunder you have over again, p. 89. Or if you had
 turned to the place it self that you are speaking of, Malel. chronogr. p.
 90. you would have found that this exposition, as it was not Dr. Hody's,
 so neither was it Mr. Chilmead's, but Mr. I. Gregory's, taken out of his
 miscellany tracts published in English 4to. p. 147. Here's a critick for
 you, as well read in what he has not seen, as in what he has.

V. Despising the author as well as the criticism with an, it is not my
 province to trample on what lies prostrate at my feet.

W. But τοὶς κειμένους ἐπεμβαλεῖν, is mortuis insilire, Sir. To trample
 on those that lie prostrate, as dead men in their graves, not as vanquish'd
 enemies at the feet of the conqueror. You must learn to construe
 Greek and Latin, Sir, before you write any more books in criticism. Yet
 even did this man think himself good enough to undertake Dr. Bentley.

Observe it, reader, and consider the consequence: when once Bau-

ter bath broke in upon a man's reputation, how securely ignorance will follow its leader.

I have done with you, Sir. And I think there is not one single article advanced against the Dr. throughout your whole Book, of which I have not given a fair account. Or if some little things may have escaped me, I promise you to give them, upon demand, the regard they shall deserve. As for what I have written, some few little odd exceptions you may make to here and there a particular passage: I saw them, and I passed them over; I was willing to leave you here and there a cavilling gap, an 'twere but on purpose to draw you on, and lay before you the temptation of exposing yourself to fresh disgraces. But take my advice, Sir, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*: Return your sword into its scabbard, and let's hear no more of you. You are not a person made for the humbling of Dr. Bentley. You have not the way of doing these things; the style, the wit, and the delicate turn: nothing in you but blunt confidence. Your friends (if you have any that will deal freely with you) will tell you the same.

One word to the postscript, and I have done. That that postscript is not of your own writing, I have before told you, I am certain. My reason for it is, because 'tis written in English, in a style and language that a man may understand it. Be the author of it who he will; all that I shall say to him is this: That since he hath so officiously made all the malice and ignorance of your book his own: all that is said to you let him take to himself.

I had designed, in imitation of your honourable patron's charitable instructions to Dr. Bentley, to have concluded my address to you also with two or three articles of advice. But I am afraid 'twould be lost labour. And besides, several hints of this nature you will find loosely scattered abroad in the foregoing papers, which you may easily draw together, and make what use of them you please. One thing let me most seriously and importunately beg of you, which is this: If you are resolved still to go on writing in this kind, let the Bible alone. For in good earnest, 'tis a most scandalous thing, to see a man so gravely quoting texts of Scripture, when he is upon so unchristian a work as is that of bearing false witness against his neighbour. I am,

Sir,

Your unknown, &c.

NOTICE OF

A HEBREW, LATIN, AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY.
By J^S. SAMUEL C. F. FREY. To be compiled in 12
Parts. Pr. 8s. small paper, 12s. royal, per part.

THERE perhaps never was a time, during the promulgation of Christianity, when there was so urgent a necessity for the am-

provement of Hebrew literature, as that in which we live. Infidelity, like a mighty flood, has attempted to sweep into oblivion the truths of the sacred scriptures, and to substitute the empty Mythology of the Greeks, and other pagan nations. Were we to inquire into the cause of this serious dereliction, we should find that it arose from a complete ignorance of the sacred language. Governments, as has been judiciously remarked by one of your correspondents, have not made the Hebrew, so necessary for a true understanding of the scriptures, a qualification for those whose business it is to officiate at the altar. This omission has been most severely felt by all ranks of professing Christians, during the last twenty five years: for the flagrant errors in all the European translations have caused the sacred volume to be neglected, first by intelligent men, and lastly by the lower orders of society.

It must therefore give every good man much pleasure, to see such a display of ability for the elucidation of the scriptures, as has not only made its appearance in the *Classical Journal*, but also in other publications. And it is a high gratification, that *valuable works* to aid the great cause of eternal truth are making their appearance in various directions.

The first part of this work contains an Alphabetical Vocabulary of all the Hebrew words, in all their variations, used in the Old Testament.

Second, All the Chaldee words in the Bible.

Third, A Complete catalogue of all the proper names. The pronunciation of these names is not according to the rules of any grammar, but as they are used in scripture.

Fourth, The roots are followed by all the significations in which they, or any branches of the verbs, are respectively used.

Fifth, To the Derivatives are annexed the significations appropriate to each.

Sixth, Words derived from obsolete roots, and the precise significations of which are doubtful, are accompanied with the different senses in which they are understood by the most learned critics.

Seventh, For the names of plants, animals, &c. advantage has been taken of the information of the best Critics, Naturalists, and travellers.

Eighth, To assist the student in writing exercises, the author has added a copious Vocabulary of English words, and another of Latin words, with the Hebrew words corresponding, but without prefixes, suffixes, and vowels; to avoid unnecessary extent and expense.

The student who has made sufficient progress in Hebrew to

write exercises, or to translate into it, either from the English, or Latin, will be sufficiently acquainted with the manner of forming the different inflections of the verb, and with the varieties of the nouns, to know where to look in the former part of the Dictionary, where he will find the precise form of the word which he may want, with the proper serviles and vowels. For example he wants, *his words*,—seek for *word*, and you find opposite to it *דבר*. As there is no prefix wanted, seek in the preceding part for *דבר*, and you will find *דבריו* *his words*. This process pursued for a little while, will increase his familiarity with the structure of the language, and with the words which it contains.

It is observable, the author has given the public a paper, worthy of the work—and the typographical execution does him the utmost credit. A new and elegant portrait of the author will be given gratis to the subscribers.

It is understood that Mr. Frey will shortly publish, *Rudiments of the Hebrew language, with Rules, Examples, and Exercises, for translating from English into Hebrew, as well as from Hebrew into English; together with a key of the book of Psalms, containing the true pronunciation; different significations, and grammatical analysis of every word.*

NOTICE OF

HORÆ PELASGICÆ; PART THE FIRST. Containing an Inquiry into the Origin and Language of the Pelasgi, or ancient Inhabitants of Greece; with a Description of the Pelasgic or Æolic Digamma, as represented in the various Inscriptions in which it is still preserved: and an Attempt to determine its genuine Pelasgic Pronunciation. By HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. Cambridge, 1815. 8vo. pp. 146. 7s. 6d. Murray.

WHEN it was announced that the subject of Pelasgic antiquities was to be handled by a writer so celebrated as Dr. Marsh, we na-

turally expected the appearance of his treatise with great impatience, and, as soon as it appeared, hastened to prepare a notice of it for our readers. From his acquirements, his industry, his judgment, and above all, from his accurate and extensive acquaintance with German literature, that is to say, with the literature of a nation who have contributed infinitely more than any other to the elucidation of classical as well as sacred antiquity, we of course expected a most satisfactory result of his inquiries; and it would appear as an insult to the opinion of our classical readers, were we to declare that we have not been disappointed. Where it is impossible to write any thing but praise, a dissertation of our own would be utterly tiresome and offensive to our readers; and, therefore, all that we shall do, is to give as brief an analysis as possible of the work, accompanied with proper extracts: but the subject to be examined includes so very extensive a field for inquiry, that even compressing the matter as much as possible, we shall be obliged to exceed our usual limits.

"As the Pelasgi," says Dr. M. "according to Strabo, were not only μέγα ἔθνος¹ but τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δυναστευσάντων ἀρχαῖοι², an inquiry into their origin and language cannot fail to excite the interest of the scholar, the philosopher, and the historian. Yet there is hardly an historical question which has been involved in greater perplexity; and certainly none, on which opinion has been more divided. These same Pelasgi have by turns been represented, in the works of modern writers, as Egyptians, Philistines, Phœnicians,³ Bactrians, Scythians, Goths, and Celts, according as it best suited their respective systems. But though we cannot obtain the certainty of historical evidence for the origin of so ancient a people, we may obtain something more solid than mere conjecture: we may at least derive the benefit of historical induction.

¹ Lib. xiii. p. 621. ed. Casaubon.

² Lib. vii. p. 327.

³ Fessler, in his *Introductio in studium Ling. Orientalium*, p. 16, (prefixed to his *Institut. LL. OO.* 8vo. Wratislaviæ, 1787) has given the following scale of the colonization of the earth. (We merely cite the part relating to the Pelasgi.)

SYRI.	
Phœnicii.	Leucosyri.
Arabes.	Pelasgi.
	Græci.

He deduces from the inhabitants of Caucasus, the Assyrians, from whom he again deduces the Syrians on one hand, and the Chaldeans on the other. At p. 19, he says, "Ex diversis—Scytharum, Syrorum, et Phœniciorum Consilio PELASGI, et ex his Græci originem traxerunt." REVIEWER.

To give this historical induction the weight of which it is capable, we must collect all the accounts which can be obtained of the Pelasgi, from the writings of the Greeks themselves: we must arrange those accounts in such an order, as will best enable us to trace the Pelasgi upwards, as high as our data will carry us; and then consider what probable conclusion may be drawn."

Dr. M. begins his collection with the testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a very acute writer, who took particular pains to discover the origin and history of the Pelasgi, though he represents them as αὐτόχθονες in that country, beyond which his researches did not carry him. He says,¹ 'Ὡς τὸ τῶν Πελασγῶν γένος Ἑλληνικόν, ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τὸ ἀρχαῖον. Ἐχρήσατο δὲ τύχαις δυσπότμοις, εἰς πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μάλιστα δ' εἰς τὴν πολυπλανόν τε, καὶ οὐδενὸς τόπου βέβαιον οἰκισιν. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸ καλούμενον νῦν Ἀχαικὸν Ἀργὸς ἤκησαν αὐτόχθονες ὄντες, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ αὐτῶν λέγουσι. τὴν δὲ ἑπωρυμνίαν ἔλαβον ἐξ ἀρχῆς ταύτην ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγοῦ βασιλείως. There is a difference, however, in regard to the *part* of Peloponnesus, which they are supposed to have occupied: some writers represent *Achaia* as their original country, while others place them in the adjacent country of *Arcadia*.² But whatever part of Peloponnesus they first occupied, they gradually spread themselves over the whole peninsula, which was thence originally called *Pelasgia*.³ The old inhabitants of the northern coast of Peloponnesus, who, according to Herodotus, changed afterwards their name to Ionians, were distinguished by the title of Πελασγοὶ Αἰγυιαῖες,⁴ while the Arcadians were distinguished by the title of Πελασγοὶ Ἀρκάδες.⁵ Greece, likewise, *without* the isthmus, appears to have been originally inhabited by these same Pelasgi.⁶ They were likewise in possession of Boeotia, Phocis, and Euboea.⁷ That the Pelasgi established themselves also on the western side of Greece appears from the oracle of Dodona, which Strabo calls Ὁ Pelasgῶν ἰδρυμα: and from

¹ Horæ Pelasg. p. 1—2.

² Antiquitates Romanae, l. i. c. 17.

³ Plutarch, *Quest. Romm.* (tom. ii. p. 286, ed. Xylandri) speaking of the Arcadians, compares them with their native oak. Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* l. iv. c. 6) says that Arcadia was once called *Pelasgis*; and Pausanias (l. viii. c. 1) says in reference to a former writer, Πελασγοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, γενέσθαι καὶ τῇ χώρᾳ Πελασγίαν φησὶν ὄνομα.

⁴ See Strabo (l. v. p. 221): Herodotus (l. ii. c. 171): Callimach. *Hymn. in Pallad.* l. 4, and Spanheim's note tom. ii. p. 607, ed. Ernesti; and Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* i. 1024, where the Greek scholiast says, in reference to Peloponnesus, τὸ παλαιὸν Πελασγίς ἐκαλεῖτο.

⁵ Herod. vii. 94.

⁶ Herod. i. 146.

⁷ See Herod. i. 57. viii. 44. v. 64. vi. 137. Thucyd. ii. 17. Pausan. i. 28. Strab. ix. p. 401, and Dionys. Hal. i. 28.

⁸ See Dionys. Hal. i. 18. Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* i. 1024, and his Scholiast.

⁹ vii. p. 327, and Herod. ii. 52.

the circumstance, that Homer¹ has given the title of Pelasgic to Jupiter Dodonæus. They established themselves in Epirus, as appears from Strabo:² and also in Thessaly, as appears from the epithet Πελασγικόν, which Homer³ has given to Argos.

From the expression κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν, it seems that the Pelasgi once occupied the *whole* of Greece: hence, according to Herodotus, Greece in general was originally termed Πελασγία, the name Ἑλλάς not being employed as a generic term till after the Trojan war.⁴ That the terms Ἑλλάς and Ἕλληνες were in the time of Homer confined to a district of Thessaly, appears from a passage quoted above; and that the name Ἑλλάς was not applied to Greece in general till after the Trojan war, is asserted by Thucydides.⁵

If we go northward from Thessaly to Thrace, we again trace the Pelasgi in that country from the earliest ages:⁶ in the island of Samothrace, at the mouth of the Hebrus, they instituted the mysteries of the Cabiri.⁷ Homer, too, when he describes the φῦλα Πελασγῶν, which were among the Trojan auxiliaries, represents them as neighbours of the Thracians:⁸ immediately after the Thracians, he describes the Cicones, and then the Pæonians, who lived in the neighbourhood of Mount Hæmus. Having thus gone to the extremity of the European countries which sent auxiliaries to Troy, he returns, at line 851, to the enumeration of their Asiatic auxiliaries. Since then Homer proceeds westward in his description, from the Hellespont to Mount Hæmus, and includes the φῦλα Πελασγῶν in this description, we must conclude, that like the Cicones, they then inhabited some part of the extensive country called Thrace. This inference derives additional weight from the circumstance, that the Pæonians, who are likewise included in this description, and who are sometimes represented as Thracians, were themselves a race of Pelasgi. There was, indeed, a town called Larissa, to the East of the Hellespont, near Troy; but the Larissa, from which these Pelasgi came, was far distant from Troy:

¹ Il. II. 233. Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναίῃ, Πελασγικέ.

² v. p. 221.

³ Il. B. 681. Compare Strabo, v. p. 221. Dionys. Hal. i. 17. the Scholiast on Apoll. Rhod. Argon. i. 14. and Apoll. Rhod. himself, Argon. i. 580. and the Schol. See also Herod. i. 56. Strabo v. p. 220. vii. p. 329.

⁴ See Herod. ii. 56, viii. 44. The term Pelasgi is frequently used by Latin writers to denote the Greeks in general, especially those of the early ages of Greece. See Virgil, Æn. i. 626, ii. 83, 151. Ovid, Met. xii. 19. Her. ix. 3.

⁵ i. 3.

⁶ If they occupied both Thrace and Thessaly, they must have occupied the intermediate country of Macedonia, which is frequently considered as attached either to the one, or to the other. See Herod. i. 56, Strab. x. p. 471, and Justin, vii. 1.

⁷ Herod. ii. 51.

⁸ Il. B. 840.

for when their leader Hippothous was killed by Ajax, Homer says¹ that he fell

Τῆλ' ἀπὸ Λαπίσσης ἐριβόλανος.

And the reasons already assigned prevent us from seeking with Strabo² for this Pelasgic Larissa at any distance to the south of Troy. Heyne therefore says,³ "*Suspitari licet inter Thraces Europæ consedissee turmas Pelasgorum.*" At any rate, we know from Herodotus, that the island of Samothrace, at the mouth of the Hebrus, was occupied at a very early age by the Pelasgi.⁴

Having thus made a very complete collection of what respects the Pelasgi in the Greek writers, Dr. M., after many remarks, we need not say distinguished by accuracy and acuteness, but which on account of their extent, we cannot here cite, concludes his first chapter in the following manner :

"After all, then, we must be contented with tracing the Pelasgi up to their *European* settlement in Thrace. Beyond that limit their history is all conjecture. We may infer, indeed, from the known progress of migration, that among the ancestors of the *Thracian* Pelasgi some must have been once established in *Asia Minor*; and Menecrates Elaite, in his work *περὶ κτίσεων*, asserted that they actually were so.⁵ We may further conclude, that *their* ancestors were once established still more to the eastward. But Thrace will still remain the limit of the *actual knowledge*, which we possess, on the origin of the Pelasgi. And it is useful to know the limit; for hence we know, when we are arguing about the Pelasgi, whether we are building on a rock, or building on the sand."

Having thus traced the origin of the Pelasgi, as far as his data would admit, Dr. M. proceeds, in the second chapter, to inquiries respecting their language. The extreme labor attending such researches need scarcely be mentioned to such of our readers as dedicate their time to inquiries into the tongue of ancient nations; and no description which we could give would convey any adequate idea of it to such as have not turned their studies that way. For nearly the same reasons, we shall give but a very brief account of this chapter; because our philological readers would not be contented with the very meagre sketch which could be given in an article of this kind, and therefore would naturally examine the book itself; while readers who are not critics, or who would, in the language of the Benteian age, rank themselves in the class of "*elegant scholars*," would certainly not be interested with a detail of the kind; supposing they could, by any miracle, summon suf-

² Il. P. 301.

³ xiii. p. 621.

¹ Tom. iv., p. 417, of his edition of Homer.

⁴ Hore Pelasg. p. 2—11.

⁵ Strabo, lib. xiii. p. 621.

ficient resolution to read through it, leaving for a few moments the flowery fields of Parnassus.

What language the Pelasgi spake was a question even in the time of Herodotus, who confesses himself unable to furnish any satisfactory answers: ἦν τινα γλῶσσαν ἴσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ οὐκ ἔχω ἀπορρῆως εἰπεῖν;¹ but we shall conclude, he thinks, that they spake some barbarous dialect (βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν) if we argue from the remnant of the Pelasgi, who occupy the town of Creston, beyond the Tyrrhenians. If, therefore, the people of Creston spake a language different from their neighbours, Herodotus inferred that their language was a remnant of the Pelasgi. This test, however, was not satisfactory: the Crestonians were a race of Thracians:² and we learn from Strabo,³ that people of various nations mingled themselves with the Thracians. In addition to this, Thucydides⁴ has made a distinction between the ἔθνος Ἡελασγικὸν and the ἔθνος Κρησιωνικόν. The Crestonian dialect cannot, therefore, be regarded as genuine Pelasgic: and the reasoning on which Herodotus has founded his test, falls immediately to the ground.

If we thoroughly consider the subject, we shall have abundant reason to conclude that the Pelasgi spake Greek. Dr. M. examines the objections which have or might be made to this opinion, from the nominal distinction between the ἔθνος Πελασγικὸν and the ἔθνος Ἑλληνικόν: and afterwards⁵ proceeds as follows:

" Indeed, Herodotus himself, though he opposes the language of the Hellenes to the language of the Pelasgi, has afforded us the means of proving, that γλῶσσα Πελασγική, and γλῶσσα Ἑλληνική, are only *different terms for the same language*. In the very chapter (Lib. i. cap. 56) where he draws the line between the ἔθνος Πελασγικόν, and the ἔθνος Ἑλληνικόν, he makes *another* division of the Greeks, and likewise in reference to their *language*. This division is the Γένος Δωρικόν, and the Γένος Ἰωνικόν. The Γένος Δωρικόν, he adds, belonged to the ἔθνος Πελασγικόν: and, moreover, he adds at the end of the chapter, that this very term ΔΩΡΙΚΟΝ was given to the ἔθνος Πελασγικόν, when it settled in Peloponnesus, (ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἐλθὼν Δωρικὸν ἐκλήθη.) Is not this an admission, that the Pelasgi spake the Doric dialect, and consequently a dialect of that very language, which was used by Herodotus himself? Further, says Herodotus in the same chapter, that as the Pelasgic nation included the Dorian genus, so the Dorian genus included the Lacedæmonians. But, who has ever doubted whether the Lacedæmonians spake Greek?"

We must content ourselves with one quotation more from this part of the work.

¹ Lib. i. 57.

² Herodot. v. 3.

³ Strab. vii. p. 495, 304, 305.

⁴ Thucyd. iv. 109.

⁵ Hor. Pelasg. p. 27.

"If further proof were wanted, we might appeal again to Herodotus himself, in the place where he afterwards describes the religion of the Pelasgi. He says (Lib. ii. cap. 52) that the Pelasgi worshipped and sacrificed to the gods, but without knowing their names, which they long afterwards learnt when those names were brought from Egypt. *Χρόνῳ πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος, ἐπέθογον ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπικόμενα τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν Θεῶν.* But he says they invoked the gods by the general name of ΘΕΟΙ. His own words are ΘΕΟΥΣ δὲ προσωνόμασάν σφας ἀπὸ τοιούτου, ὅτι κόσμῳ ΘΕΝΤΕΣ τὰ πάντα πηγήματα. Now, if the Pelasgi not only called the gods ΘΕΟΙ, but so called them from ΘΕΩ, the root of τίθημι, because the gods founded all things, what better evidence can we have that the Pelasgi spake Greek?

"It was, indeed, too common with the Greek writers to call their ancestors *barbarians*, as if they had belonged to a totally different race. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the Cratylus of Plato, which serves at the same time to show, that the reproach was without foundation. After an examination of many other words, says Hermogenes to Socrates, But what do you think of the words ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ? To which Socrates replies (tom. i. p. 409, ed. Serrani), Ἐννοῶ ὅτι πολλὰ οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀνόματα, ἄλλως τε ὑπὸ τοῖς βαρβάροις οἰκούντες, παρὰ των ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ εἰλήφασιν. And he adds, Εἴτις ζητοῖ ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν ἙΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΝ φωνὴν ὡς ἐοικώς κεῖται, ἀλλὰ μὴ κατ' ἐκείνην ἐξ ἧς τὸ ὄνομα τυγχάνει ὄν, οἶσθα ὅτι ἀποροῖ ἄν. Here the term βάρβαροι is applied to the ancient inhabitants of Greece, as if they had spoken a different language from that which was used by Socrates and Plato. The same assertion is repeated at p. 425, παρὰ βαρβάρων τινῶν αὐτὰ παρελήφμεν· εἰσι δὲ ἡμῶν ἀρχαιοτέροι βάρβαροι. But if the same terms were common both to the ancient and to the modern inhabitants of Greece, we cannot infer, that the language of the one was different from the language of the other, though the language of the one was more polished than that of the other. In fact, when Socrates is made to say, that the terms ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ were not of Hellenic but of barbaric origin, nothing more could be meant, than that those words, as being primitives in the Greek language, were capable of no further resolution in that language. Nothing therefore was left, in regard to the derivation of these words, than to do as we always do in deriving the primitives of any language; namely, to inquire in what other language or languages these words had been previously used. On the supposition, therefore, that the ancient inhabitants of Greece spake a barbarous language, it appeared that sufficient provision had been made for the etymology of ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ. But, in fact, it was the same sort of etymology as it would be, if we derived a word in Klopstock or Wieland from a word used by Kero or Ottfried; and it amounts to nothing more than that ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ were used in Greece above a thousand years before Socrates was born. But, says Socrates further, (p. 410) Ὅρα τοίνυν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ΠΤΡ μῆτι βάρβαρον ἢ τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδε ῥάδιον προσάψαι ἐστὶν ἙΛΛΗΝΙΚῃ φωνῇ φανεροῖ τ' εἰσὶν οὕτως αὐτὸ καλοῦντες ΦΡΥΓΕΣ, σμικρὸν τι παρακλίνοντες. Now all this is perfectly consistent with the opinion, that the Pelasgi spake Greek. The language of the Pelasgi was planted in a common soil with many other languages, and of course had numerous words in common

with other languages. And its agreement with the Phrygian in particular cannot appear extraordinary, when we consider what Herodotus says, Lib. vii. cap. 73. Οἱ δὲ Φρύγες, ὡς Μακεδόνες λέγουσι, ἐκάλουντο Βεῖγες χρόνον ὅσον Εὐρωπῆς ὄντες σὺνοικοι ἦσαν Μακεδόσι. Now, if the Phrygians were originally neighbours of the Macedonians, and used the Macedonic dialect, in substituting B for Φ, it is no wonder that Greek words should be found among the Phrygians. Indeed, the two words, which Plato selected are common to a great variety of languages. The Hebrew **אֵשׁ**, that is *ur*, signifies fire. The same word (probably not derived from the Hebrew, but drawn from a common source) was used by the Pelasgi, and pronounced after their peculiar mode *Fur*, which the Macedonians (probably also the Phrygians, of whom Plato says *σμικρὸν τι παρακλίνοντες*) pronounced *Bur*, and the other Greeks *Πυρ*. The word *ὕδωρ*, pronounced by the Pelasgi *Fudwr*, is connected with the Saxon word *Water*, as their *Fur* is connected with the Saxon *Fyr*. In short, the two words selected by Plato as words of barbaric origin, were only words which both ancient and modern Greeks had in common with many other nations, who drew from the same source.*

Dr. M. afterwards goes on to show that one principal difference between Pelasgic Greek and more polished Greek was occasioned by the use of the Digamma. We learn from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,¹ that the Pelasgi said *Feλένη, καὶ Fάναξ, καὶ Foῖκος, καὶ Fάνης, καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα*: and that the form of the Digamma was, *ὥσπερ Γάμμα, διτταῖς ἐπὶ μίαν ὁρθὴν ἐπιζευγνύμενον ταῖς πλαγίαις*. The antiquity of this digamma appears from his saying *σύνηθες ἦν τοῖς ἀρχαιοῖς Ἑλλήσιν*. Upon the whole, Dr. M. concludes, that Pelasgic Greek was in truth *Æolic*; and, consequently, that instead of using the term *Æolic Digamma*, it would be more correct to say *Pelasgic Digamma*.

The third chapter treats of the *form* of the Digamma as represented in ancient inscriptions and similar documents. Here we need only mention, that the Digamma occurs in two forms: namely F, like the Latin F, except that both cross strokes are of the same length; and C, which occurs in a few coins, and in the Codex Bezae, Mark xv. 33, (p. 650. ed. Kipling).

The fourth chapter treats concerning the pronunciation of the Digamma, which Dr. M. has shown was pronounced like the Latin F, not as the English W. His reasoning is too connected to admit of an extract, and too concise to be abridged; and we therefore must refer the reader to the work itself. We shall conclude our account of the work, however, with one extract which contains a correction of a false interpretation, though in England a common one, of a passage in the writings of Gerard Vossius.

* That the Latin V was pronounced, not like the English W, but like

¹ Lib. i. 20.

the English V, is an opinion conformable with that of Gerard Vossius, one of the most eminent among the Latin grammarians since the revival of learning; though, by a strange fatality, a passage in his treatise *De Arte Grammaticæ* has contributed more, than any other cause, to propagate in England the contrary opinion. In his treatise, *De Arte Grammaticæ*, lib. i. c. 24, he cautions his readers against pronouncing F and V in the same manner; and he thus argues, that they had a different sound: aliter F, aliter V, sonare argumento sunt voces in quibus utraque occurrit, ut *rafer, favea, fovea, fulvus*, et similes. Now, if Gerard Vossius had been writing for English readers, this caution would have been unnecessary: for it is not usual, at least in this country, to pronounce V like F. But it is a rule in the German language to pronounce V like F:¹ their W being the letter which has the sound of the English V. Hence the Germans pronounce *Wind*, as if it were written *Vind*; and *Vater* (which is the German for *Father*) they pronounce as if it were written *Fater*: the word *Volk*, which corresponds to the English *Folk*, they pronounce as if it were written *Folk*. This pronunciation of V like F in German words was transferred to the pronunciation of Latin words. That it was so in the time of Gerard Vossius, appears from what he says, c. 26, Germani pronunciant Latinorum *Vinum* quasi esset *Finum*. This pronunciation, therefore, it was his object to correct: He accordingly tells his countrymen, that they ought not to pronounce the Latin V like their V, but like their W. He instances, in c. 26, two German words corresponding with the Latin, which, according to the orthography of the sixteenth century, he writes *Wijn* and *Wint*, (now written *Wein* and *Wind*); and he adds, nec aliter extulere Latini *vinum, rentus*, quam *winum, wentus*. Again, he says in c. 24, of the manner in which the *Latins* pronounced V, in contradistinction of the manner in

¹ "I am here speaking with reference to the High German, the language of Gerard Vossius, who was a native of Heidelberg: for in the Low German, which is spoken in Lower Saxony and other parts of Northern Germany, the V has a softer sound. And the soft sound of the V in Low German has had some influence on the pronunciation even of the High German in those parts, where Low German was formerly spoken. Thus in the Electorate of Hanover, Low German, though it is now spoken only by the peasants, was once the general language; and so it remained, till after the time of Luther, when the High German became the language of literature, and was therefore adopted by men of education, even where Low German had been previously spoken. But hence arose a mixture of pronunciation; and the High German has lost in the North of Germany somewhat of that hardness, which it has ever retained in the middle and South of Germany, where it was always spoken. Hence the German V, which is pronounced as F at Dresden, Leipzig, and Wittenberg, is pronounced with a softer sound at Hanover. But Adelung, the great German grammarian, is decidedly of opinion, that to give the High German V the sound of the Low German V, is contrary to the analogy of the language: and hence he lays it down as a rule, that the proper sound of V in the High German language is the same with that of F. There is indeed one exception, namely, when it occurs in the middle of a word between two vowels. It then unavoidably assumes a softer tone; and on the same principle as that which converted the Latin F into the Latin V, when it represented the Digamma between two vowels."

which the *Germans* pronounced it; Olim vero longe etiam majus disorimen erat; quia V efferebant, ut *Germani* duplex W. Nempe pronunciabant *Winum, Wallum, Widua, Wacillare, &c.* unde nostrum *Wijn, Walle, Weduwe, Waggein, &c.* Since, then, the *Germans* pronounce W, as we pronounce V; the rule thus given by Vossius, when applied to the *English* language, would be, that the *Latin* V was pronounced like the *English* V. But *English* critics, not knowing the difference between their own W, and the *German* W, and not considering that Gerard Vossius, as a *German*, was giving rules for the *Germans*, have argued from this passage, as if Gerard Vossius was authority for the opinion, that the *Latins* pronounced *Vinum, Vallum, Vidua*, in the same manner as the *English* pronounce *Wine, Wall, Widow*. I have even seen the passage quoted with *English* examples substituted for the *German*, with the exception of the *German* word for *vacillare*, because we do not say *Wacillate*, but *Vacillate*. And as the word *nostrum* immediately precedes those examples, the quotation, with these substitutions, makes Gerard Vossius speak as if he had been a native *Englishman*.

- "The preceding remarks on the pronunciation of the *Latin* V have not been made on the supposition, that the sound of the *Greek* F depended on the sound of the *Latin* V, but merely because the two questions have been connected by most writers upon this subject. In whatever manner Cicero may have pronounced the *Latin* V, the *Pelasgi*, who brought letters into *Latium*, had no other sound for their F, than such as was given to F by the *Latins*, who learnt from them, and is still given to it by those who in their turn have learnt from the *Latins*."

We are informed by Dr. M. that the second part of the *Horæ Pelasgicæ* will contain an history of the *Greek* alphabet, from its origin to its completion. It is not yet published; but when it appears, we shall take an early opportunity of giving an analysis of it to our readers.

E. H. BARKERI EPISTOLA

AD G. H. SCHÆFERUM

De quibusdam HESYCHII et ETYMOLOGICI Glossis.

“ETYMOLOGICUM tuum,” SCHÆFERE, ut Salmasii verba in Epistola ad G. I. Vossium usurpem, “sub prelo sudare, libens audiui : præclarum opus, ut omnia tua sunt, avide expecto.” Notulas nostras in quasdam Hesychii et Etymologici illius glossas iudicio tuo hodie non veritus sum subicere. Totum humanitati, eruditioni, æquanimi- tati tuæ me devoveo. Vale, vir ἐξοχώτατε, et si jam pateris, φίλτατε.

Datum Thetfordiæ. Pridie Nonas Octobris. MDCCCXV.

Timæus Lex. Plat. : ‘Ρυμβεῖν ῥομβεῖν, τοῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς κινήσεως τοῦ ῥόμβου. “Glossam nostram descripsit Suidas : hoc verbum neque ap. Platonem inveni, neque ap. ullum veterum scriptorum.” Ruhnkenius. Alter Suidæ locus Ruhnkenium præterit : ‘Ρομβεῖν σφενδονᾶν. H. Steph. Ind. Thes. : “‘Ρομβέω, circumago, vel volvo in modum rhombi : exponitur et σφενδονᾶ a Suida.” Schneiderus Lex. Append. : “‘Ρυμβέω, Attisch s. v. a. ῥομβέω, Plato Cratyli s. 92. wie die Wolf. Handschr. und Timæus lasen, wo vorher ῥέμβειν stand.” Vox exstat quoque ap. Hesych. : Βεμβικίζει ῥομβεῖ, στρέφει, διώκει. Compositum περιρομβεῖν exstat ap. Pindari Schol. Pyth. IV, 381. : Λαμβάνουσαι αἱ φαρμακίδες τὴν ἰνύγγα, δεσμεύουσιν ἐκ τροχοῦ τινος, ὃν περιρομβοῦσιν, ἅμα ἐπάδουσαι. Eadem verba D. Schottus in Appendice affert e Lycophronis Schol. 310., et refert ad Phavor. Exstat quoque ap. Hesych. in corrupta glossa, quam optime restituit T. Hemsterh. ap. Albert. : Περικωνῆσαι περιρομβῆσαι, περιαγαγεῖν : “Περικωνῆσαι bene explicatur περιρομβῆσαι, περιαγαγεῖν : nam κῶνα, βέμβιξ, teste Hesych. et κωνᾶν, περιδινεῖν.” Idem est κωνάξω, κωνάξω, Doribus, unde Epicharmi σκυφοκῶνακτος, in qua voce ap. Hesych. lege περιφόρητος.” Verbum περιρομβεῖν in H. Steph. T. G. L. non reperitur. Schneiderus confundit κωνᾶν i. q. περιδινεῖν, a κῶνα, i. e. βέμβιξ, cum verbo κωνεῖν, unde περικωνεῖν ap. Aristoph.

¹ Mirum est T. H. non meminisse Hesych. loci supra memorati : Βεμβικίζει ῥομβεῖ, στρέφει, διώκει : ut Hesych. explicat βεμβικίζει per ῥομβεῖ, et κῶνα per βέμβιξ, quid dubitemus de explanatione τοῦ περικωνῆσαι per περιρομβεῖν?

Vesp. 598., i. e. *pice inungere*, a κῶνος, *pice liquida*. Eadem confusio ab Hesychii interpretibus, et forte ab Hesychio ipso, facta est. Verbum κωνίζειν, *pice inungere*, non agnoscit H. Steph.: de eo scribit jejune eruditiss. Schneid. in Lex. "Κωνίζω, ich piche, *pico*, von κῶνος; no. 5." Græci usurpabant non modo κωνῆσαι πίθον, sed et κωνίσαι. Fallitur Albertius, cum ad v. κωνῆσαι scribit: "Leg. κωνίσαι· πισσοκωνίσαι, a κωνίζειν, *pice inungere*, unde sup. κεκωνίσται· πεπίσσωται, κέκλυται, quod Hesych. h. l. cum κωνῆσαι, a κωνῆν, ut in aliis sæpius, confudit, non animadvertente H. Steph." Fallitur quoque T. Hemsterh., cum ad v. περικωνῆσαι, contrariò errore, i in η mutat (ut Alb. η in ι), legens κεκωνῆται pro κεκωνίσται, et διακωνῆσαι pro διακωνίσαι. Hesych. Διακωνίσαι· διακλαύσαι (l. διακαύσαι, vel potius διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ κωνίσαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν πίσση χρίσαι. Verbum διακωνίσαι, quod H. Steph. Ind. Thes. minus recte mutat in διακωνῆσαι, Schneid. omisit. Idem H. Steph. Ind. Thes. notavit confusionem vocum κωνῆσαι, et κωνίσαι, sed errat, cum putat meliorem scripturam esse διὰ τοῦ η: nam, ut diximus, Græci usurpabant et κωνίσαι πίθον, et κωνῆσαι πίθον. Hæc sunt ipsius verba:—"Κωνῆν Hesych. περιδινεῖν, *circumagere*, quod et βεμβηκίσαι. Idem Aor. κωνῆσαι exponit non solum κύκλω περιεγεγκεῖν, sed etiam πισσοκονῆσαι, unde ab Æschylo et Cratino in Cressis πισσοκονήτων μέρος dici ἔταν πίσση καταχρισθέντες τινὲς ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀποθάνωσι. Verum non modo habet κωνῆσαι per η, sed etiam κωνίσαι per ι, in utraque significatione. Nam in πισσοκονήτων dicit κωνίσαι esse τὸ περιεγεγκεῖν, forsan a κῶνος, et in serie τοῦ κ̄ cum ε, κεκωνίσται exponit πεπίσσωται, κέκλυται. Sed alteram scripturam διὰ τοῦ η meliorem esse docet Etymologus etiam, dicens κωνῆν esse τὸ στρέφειν, et κωνῆσαι ap. Aristoph. in Tagenistis τὸ περιεγεγκεῖν, a nomine κῶνης, quod est βέμβιξ. Proprie autem κωνῆσαι esse ait τὸ κέραμον πισσῶσαι."

Ex Etymologi loco a Steph. laudato manifestum est, Etymologum confundere v. κωνῆν, i. e. στρέφειν, cum v. κωνεῖν, sive κωνίζειν, i. e. *pice inungere*: cf. Kusterus ad Hesych. v. Διακωνίσαι.

Ex Hesychii locis a Steph. laudatis manifestum est, Hesychium, cum prorsus eandem faciat confusionem, agnoscere tamen et κωνίσαι et κωνῆσαι.

Si Hesychii interpretes hæc perspexissent, fortasse medicas manus ad sanos non adhibuissent locos. In Hesychio fere nihil est mutandum præter loca e literarum ordine plane vitiosa. Ut nihil sine testibus bonis dicamus, pauca afferemus exempla confusionis modo dictæ, ab ipsis grammaticis veteribus factæ inter κωνῆν, κωνεῖν, et κωνίζειν.

Hesych. Πισσοκωνήτω· περὶ πίσση χρίουσιν, ἵνα τάχιον κατακαίηται· κωνῆσαι δὲ ἐστὶ, τὸ περιεγεγκεῖν. (Phot. Lex. Ms. Πισσοκωνήτω· πυρὶ τοῦ οὐκαύστω, ἐπεὶ τὰ καίόμενα πίσση χρίεται, Αἰσχύλος Ἀθήσσαι;) Phot.

Lex. Κωνῆσαι· περινεγκεῖν, διακαῖσαι (i. διακαῦσαι, vel διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τῶν πισσοῦντων· ἐπὶ περιδινοῦσιν ἐν κύκλῳ τὰ πισσοῦμενα. Hesych. Κωνῆσαι· πισσοκοπήσαι, καὶ κύκλῳ περινεγκεῖν· καὶ Πισσοκόνιτον μόρον λέγουσιν, ὅταν πίσση καταχρισθέντες τινὲς ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀπιθάνωσιν· Δισχυλῆς καὶ Κρατινὸς Κρήσσαις· Πισσοκονία γὰρ ἡ νῦν πισιδία, ἣ χρεοῦσι τὰ παρίσθμια τῶν προβάτων. H. l. pro πισσοκοπήσαι critici scribunt πισσοκωνῆσαι, sed H. Steph. et Schneid. rectissime agnoscunt πισσοκοπέω, et πισσοκωνέω (ap. H. Steph. πισσοκωνάω scribitur, per errorem, ut infra videbimus). Emendant quoque πισσοκόνιτον per πισσοκώνητον vel πισσοκώνιτον, sed hoc non est mutandum. Hesych. in uno loco scribit πισσοκώνητον μόρον, ut in ipsa Æschyli fabula scriptum invenerat, a κωνέω derivatum; in altero loco per memoriam lapsus scribit πισσοκόνιτον μόρον, quia ei tunc in mentem forte venerat verbum κονίζω, i. q. κωνίζω (ut infra demonstrabitur), sive κωνέω: κονίζω ei h. l. versari ante animum, patet e voc. πισσοκονία, quod τῷ πισσοκόνιτον immediate subjungitur.

E v. πισσοκόνιτον omnino defenditur Hesychii glossa, quæ interpretes valde torsit: Λεωκόνιτος· λεωλέθρις, ἢ λεωκόρητος, παντελῶς ἐξολοθρευόμενος. Kusterus legit λεωκόρητος, dicens “τὸ λεωκόνιτος esse vocem nihili, vel ab ipso Hesychio ex mendoso codice excerptam, vel a librariis corruptam.” Sed omnino proba est vox λεωκόνιτος, ut vidit Albertius:—“Phot. Lex. Ms. Λεωκόρητος· ἐξολοθρευόμενος τὸ γὰρ λέως ἐστὶ τελείως, (sic) Ἀρχιλοχός· Λέως γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐφθόνησεν, καὶ Λεωργός ἀπὸ τούτου, ὁ μειωλουργός, leg. μεγαλονεργός: Galen. Gloss. Λέως· παρτελῶς, ἅπαν· Erotian. Λέως· τελείως. Rectius λείως, ut sup. suo loco, ubi male λείγως, ut λειῶρ in v. λεικόνιτος, quod τὸ λεωκόνιτος h. l. tueri queat. Sup. Κονίζεσθαι· φθείρεσθαι. Ita λεωκόνιτος est τελείως κονιζόμενος, i. e. φθειρόμενος, cum quo conveniunt seqq. interpretationes.” Λεωκόνιτος, quod ad sensum attinet, est i. q. λεωκόρητος, sed, quod ad etymologiam, valde diversum: λεωκόνιτος compositum est e duabus vocibus, λέως i. e. τελείως, et κονίζειν i. e. φθεῖρειν: at λεωκόρητος venit e λέως i. e. τελείως, et κορέω, ut mox videbimus. In Hesychio duæ glossæ sunt confusæ, quarum una, λεωκόνιτος, quod exponit per λεωλέθρις: altera, λεωκόρητος, quod exponit per

¹ Aretæus de Cur. Morb. diurn. I, 2. p. 117. ed. Boerh.: Πιττακοπία τῶ ἡπαττινι ζευγίς: ubi Maittaire in Indice: “Πιττακοπία, *pice obliuere*, πιττακοπούμενοι Athen. 565. B. ex Alexide.” Ibi doctissimus Schweigh. “Rarius occurrit verbum πιττακοπούσθαι, pro usitatore πιτταῖσθαι, quod in eadem re positum XII, p. 518. a. Repertum est tamen illud ap. alium nescio quem veterem auctorem, cuius verba citavit Clem. Alex. in Pædag. III, p. 294. ed. Pott. ubi ait: ἐγὼ κοιμίδου· ἐνθάδε πολλοὺς ἐν ᾧσιν καὶ πιπιττακοπημένους: item ap. Hesych. Κωνῆσαι· πισσοκοπήσαι, quo loco doctissimum editorem, citantem ista ex Clemente verba, præterierat hoc Alexidis testimonium.” Voc. πιττακοπία omisit H. Steph., notante Maittaire l. c.

τοῦ, ἔρημον μὴ ποιεῖ οἰκητόρων διὰ τῶν πολέμων· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἀρά τις αὐτῇ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ὥς που καὶ Μένανδρός φησιν, Ἐκκορηθείς σύ γε, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀρθὴν ἀπολεσθείης. (Id est, proprio verbi sensu retento, “May you be swept from the earth!”) Menandri phrasis ab Eustathio expōnitur ὅλως ἐκτμηθείης, notante H. Steph. T. G. L. II. p. 372. Alciphro III, 62. Ἄλλ’ ἐκκυριασθείης ὅτι ἄκαιρος εἰ καὶ λάλος, ubi bene Berglerus: “Ita scriptum, fortasse ἐκκορηθείης.” Iterum Suid. Ἐκκορηθείης· παντελῶς ἀφανισθείης· Μένανδρος, Ἐκκορηθείης σύ γε. Hesych. Ἐκκοροῦσιν· φθείρουσιν, ἐκκαλύνουσιν: ubi Albertius: “Cf. lepidum Parmenionis Epigr. in Antholog. I. 6. n. 3.

οἱ κόρις ἄχρι κόρου κορέσαντό μου· ἀλλ’ ἐκορέσθην
ἄχρι κόρου καὶ τὸς κόρις ἐκκορίσας.

Cimices ad satietatem saturati sunt de me, at saturatus sum et ipse ad satietatem cimices *perdendo*, sive *everrendo*: vid. Casaub. ad Theophr. Char. c. 22. p. 340. ibidemque De Pauw, p. 184. qui *everrendi* notionem retinet, a *κόρις*, *scoræ*, ut improprie φθείρουσιν exponat Hesych. ex consequenti nimirum, et eo, quod post ἐκκορεῖν sæpe fit.” Casauboni locus, ad quem refert Albertius, est hic:— “Καὶ ἀναστὰς, τὴν οἰκίαν καλλῦναι, καὶ τὰς κλῖνας ἐκκορῆσαι: Hesych., qui τὸ κορεῖν etiam φθεῖρειν exponit, videtur hoc voluisse dicere, eam vocem a *κόρις* deductam, interdum accipi pro *cimices occidere*, vel *cimicibus lectos purgare*, quod *cimicare* Lat. dicitur, ut *pulicare*, Græci φθειρίζειν: atque hæc interpretatio locum hic habere potest: Parmenio poeta ἐκκορίζειν dixit in lepidissimo disticho ap. Anthol. I, 6. p. 19.” Quod ad Theophrastum attinet, fallitur Casaub.: sensus verborum, τὰς κλῖνας ἐκκορῆσαι, plane patet e præcedentibus verbis, τὴν οἰκίαν καλλῦναι. Fallitur Casaub., credens Hesych. vocem ἐκκορεῖν a *κόρις* voluisse deducere, id quod Hesychius nequicquam voluisset. Fallitur Casaub., credens Hesych., cum v. ἐκκοροῦσιν exponit per φθείρουσιν, intelligere i. q. sibi voluisset, si dixisset φθειρίζουσιν, i. e. *cimices occidunt*; nam ἐκορεῖν, loco τοῦ φθεῖρειν usurpatum, venit e proprio verbi sensu *evertere*, deinde *verrendo perdere*, sive animalia, ut cimices, sive res inanimatas, deinde generatim *perdere*, ut in Menandri loco, Ἐκκορηθείς σύ γε. Fallitur quoque idem vir vere eruditissimus, cum κορεῖν facit i. q. ἐκκορίζειν: κορεῖν est *everrendo perdere*, at ἐκκορίζειν, *cimices verrendo perdere*: tanta est distantia inter κορεῖν et κορίζειν, quanta inter

Hemsterh.: “Τὸ κόρημα pro purgamentis Attici non admittunt, ut docemur ab Atticæ loquelæ magistris, pro qua tamen significatione pugnat Aristophanis auctoritate Pollux; Hesych. κόρημα· κάλλυττον, ὅ τινος σαρ·: inde, diminuta vocis forma, κορημάτιον *scorula*, in Vet. Onom., quamvis et ibid. Κόρημα· *scobis*.” Voc. κορημάτιον omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Vel κόρος Hesychio est κάλλυττον; exemplum hujus significationis nondum invenimus.

φθειρειν et φθειρίζειν. Ex hoc igitur metaphorico verbi κορεῖν sensu pro *perire* venit λεωκόρητος, i. e. παντελῶς ἐξωλοθρευμένος.

Vocem λέως H. Steph. tantum obiter notat in v. λεωργός, Thes. II, p. 599., et proprium ei locum in Thes. non tribuit: "Videndum," ait H. St., "num deduci possit λεωργός a λεῶς, quod Galenus ap. Hippocr. accipi scribit pro παντελῶς, ἅπαν." Idem etymon Photio quoque, ut modo vidimus, placuerat. Apollon. Dyscol. p. 548. Sturz. λέως a τελείως per aphæresin derivat: Αἱ διάλεκτοι ἀφαιροῦσι καὶ πλεονάζουσι, ἐν τῇ, ὁρτῇ, τελείως, λέως, τρόμος, τέτρομος, ἐγῶ, ἐγάνη. Ut vox scribitur tribus modis, λέως, λείως, λίως, sic voces, quarum prima pars ex hac voce originem suam trahit, tribus modis ap. Hesych. scribuntur. In ejus Lexico habemus sequentia vocabula e voce λέως derivata, λεωκόνιτος, λεωλέθρος, λεωλέθρις, λεώλης, λεωκόρητος: e voce λείως, λειοκόνιτος, (quod infra mutamus in λειοκάνισις), λειωκόρης: ¹ e voce λίως, λιολέθρια: Λιολέθρια: παντελεῖ

¹ Notanda est vox λειωκόρης, quam omisit Schneid. H. Steph. in Ind. Thes. scribit: "Λειοκόρης Hesych. ὁ τελείως ἐκκαυμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχων: ordo alphab. pro eo requirit λειφοκόρης." J. Voss. scribit λειωκόρης, quod literarum ordo admittit. Albertius refert ad glossam: Κόρας ὀφθαλμούς, et addit, "quod huc pertinere docet interpretatio." Pro ἐκκαυμένους G. legit ἐκκαυμένους. Λειω esse veram scripturam primæ partis vocis, patet ex Hesychii interpretatione τελείως: nam λείως i. q. τελείως: et κόρης a κόρη, i. q. ὄψις, ὀφθαλμός, esse posteriorem vocis partem, æque patet ex Hesychii interpretatione, per ὀφθαλμούς. Sed quid sibi velit ista vox λειωκόρης, e vocabulis λείως i. q. τελείως, et κόρη i. q. ὀφθαλμός, derivata? et quomodo ad vocem sic compositam pertineat Hesychii explanatio, ὁ τελείως ἐκκαυμένους (ἐκκαυμένους) τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς? Suspiciamus Hesychii verba, quibus λειωκόρης explicare voluit, esse quodammodo corrupta. Hesych. Λείη· ἡ προσήτης, καὶ καλή: Λείως· τελείως, καλῶς.

A Lexicographis notanda est vox λιάξ sive λιάξ, quod male omisit Schneid. De ea H. Steph. Ind. Thes.: "Λιάξ Hesych. παῖς ἀρχηγίνιος, forsitan παρὰ τὰ λείος, quod læves et glabras genas haberet." In Thes. II, p. 662. A. sic scribit: "Λιάξ i. q. λῆιος, v. l. Etymol. derivat a λῆιος, sed non exponit." Mirum est hunc sagacissimum virum non vidisse λιάξ esse i. q. λῆιαξ: mirum quoque corruptam vocem ἀρχηγίνιος retinere pro ἀρτιγίνιος. "In Glossis legimus, ἀρχηγίνιος· ἀπυγίπος, imo ἀρτιγίνιος," Dorvillius ad Charit. p. 216. ed. 1783., notante Albertio. Bene H. Steph. vocem λιάξ i. e. παῖς deducit a λῆιος: λιάξ i. q. λειογένιος, i. e. prima florens lanugine: J. Pollux II, 10. περὶ ἀνδρῶν: Ἀγένιος, λειογένιος, ἰούλων τῶν ὑπανθῶν, παρὰ τὰ ὅσα καθέκοντα τὸν ἱούλον ἔχων (ubi non viderunt interpretes Pollucem ad Xenoph. Sympos. p. 515, 41. respexisse παρὰ τὰ ὅσα ἄρτι ἱούλος καθέκοντα). "Imberbis adhuc Adonis, et λῆιος, prima duntaxat lanugine genas habens insignes, in hoc ipso carmine dicitur v. 85. πρῶτον ἱούλον ἀπὸ κρετάρων καταβάλλον· Ὁ τριφίλῃτος Ἀδωνίς." Valck. ad Adoniaz. p. 408, C. J. Pierseus λῆιαξ pro λιάξ corrigit, quod literarum series vetat: Mæris p. 419. ψιλὰξ, Ἀριστεφάνης· ψιλὸς καὶ λῆιος, Ἕλληνας· Thom. Mag. ψιλὰξ, ποιηταὶ, οὗ

δλέθρῳ: Ruhnk. Ep. Crit. I, p. 55. legit λεωλεθρίῳ, male, utpote et non necessarium, et contra literarum seriem: lege λιωλεθρίῳ. Hæc distinctiones neglexerunt H. Steph. et Schneid., ap. quos nihil invenias de variis modis idem vocab. scribendi, et simplex λείως, λίως, et compositum, ut in λεωλέθριος, λειωκόρης, λιω. νία, ceterisque vocibus.¹

'Αριστοφάνης· φίλος καὶ λείος, λογογράφοι. H. Steph. Ind.: "φίλακα Hesych. φίλον et λείον, item πτερον." (Pausan. in Lacon. p. 258. φίλα γὰρ καλοῦσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς τὰ πτερά: Glossæ Labbeanæ: φιλοβάφος phlymatius: voc. φιλοβάφος omisit H. Steph., ut et Schneid.) "Hesych. φίλακα· φίλον, λείον: Λίαξ· παῖς ἀρτιγίνιος: i. λίαξ a λείος: sunt autem diminutiva, ut a βῦλος βῶλαξ, βῶμος βῶμαξ, λίθος λίθαξ, μύλος μύλαξ, νίος νίαξ." Pierson. ad Mær. p. 419. Adde hæc λειμὼν, λείμαξ: σινάπυ, σινάπυξ. Hesych. Σινάπυξ· γογγυλῖς: voc. σινάπυξ omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Voc. λίθαξ H. Steph. in Thes. II. p. 709, A. posuit, sed in Indice omisit. Alia exempla diminutivorum in αξ larga manu dedit Bast. ad Gregor. p. 241. De verbo ἀρτιγινιάζω H. Steph. Ind. scribit: "Ἀρτιγινιάζω ex Theophrasto affertur pro recens pubesco, non ita pridem barbam emisi: sed vereor ne divisim scribendum sit." Vox occurrit in Anthol. ined. ap. Dorv. ad Charit. p. 216. ed. Lips.: Ἀρτιγινιάζων ὁ καλὸς καὶ στίρφος ἐραστὴς: Ἀρτιγίνιος χείρας occurrit Anal. Diodor. Sard. VI. Voc. ἀρτίχηνος omiserunt H. Stêph. et Schneid.: occurrit ap. Theocriti Schol. V. 3. Πύρρος ὁ ἀρτίχηνος ὁ ἦδη παγωνίτης (Ecce v. παγωνίτης, de qua H. Steph. III, p. 641. "Παγωνίτης, et παγωνίτης, Suida teste, epitheton Jovis est i. e. barbatus"). In Theocrit. XI, 9. divisim legitur, Ἀρτί γινιάσθων περὶ τὸ στῆμα τὰς κροτάφους τι. H. Steph. I, p. 844, H.: "Ἡμιγίνιος, semibarbatus, in v. I." Nullum testimonium adduxit Schneid. Sed vox exstat in Theocrit. VI, 3. ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν Πύρρος, ὁ δ' ἡμιγίνιος: ubi Schol. ἡμιγίνιος· ὁ οὐκ ἂν πᾶσαν γένυν πληρωμένον ἔχων γινίαν. Fallitur H. Steph. I, p. 844, cum de v. λιογίνιος scribit:—"Λιογίνιος, læve mentum habens. Quem λιογίνιον a Tibullo ita describi puto, In venis cui lævia fulgent Ora, nec amplexus aspera barba terit; hanc enim veram esse hujus vocis significationem ap. Herodot. (V, 20.) arbitror, in Terpsich. ἄνδρας λιογινίους vocantem: quod autem quidam interpr. λιογίνιος eum cui tenuis et mollis est barba, vel qui est in prima lanugine, minime probo." De barba tamen J. Pollucem l. c. vocem intellexisse, manifestum est e contextu, ἀγνίως, λιογίνιος, ἰούλω νίον ὑπανθῶν: de barba intellexisse L. C. Valck. l. c. voc. λείος e subjuncta interpretatione patet: "Imberbis adhuc Adonis," inquit, "et λείος, prima duntaxat lanugine genas habens insignes;" de barba intellexisse Hesych. voc. λίαξ, a λείος derivatum, planum est ex ejus interpretatione: Λίαξ· παῖς ἀρτιγίνιος. Λιογίνιος H. Steph. vertit læve mentum habens: at menti illa lævitas consistit in tenui et molli barba: ergo λιογίνιος, qui est in prima lanugine. Quod ad Herodoti locum attinet, Æm. Portus in Lex. Ionic. vertit: "Læves malas habentes, tenui mollique barba præditos, genas malas habentes."

¹ Mirum est nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. vocem λείως agnovisse, de qua Hesych.: Λείως· ἰαδίως, διηώς, σφάδρα, τιλίως, καλῶς. (De λείως i. e.

Vox *λειοκόνιτος* in altero Hesychii loco non est in *λειοκόνιτος* mutanda, quia literarum ordo vetat (sequitur enim, *Λεῖον· ὁ σῆτος, ἢ ὁμαλόν*): *Λειοκόνιτος· ἡ τελείωσις, κόνις διαλελυμένη· λείως γὰρ τελείως*. Hæc glossa est corrupta, sed non ut doctissimi viri existimant. Vocab. *λειοκόνιτος* ex Hesychii manu non profectum esse, ex ipsius verbis argui potest: *Λειοκόνιτος· ἡ τελείωσις, κόνις διαλελυμένη· λείως γὰρ τελείως*. Anne credendum est Hesych. adjectivum *λειοκόνιτος* exponere voluisse per nomina *τελείωσις* et *κόνις*? Credat Iudæus Apella. In adjectivo *λειοκόνιτος* latet nomen, ad quod *τελείωσις* et *κόνις* pertinent; idque nomen forte est *λειοκόνις*, sive *λειοκονίασις*, quod et literarum ordo admittit. Hesychius ipse agnoscit *κονίασις*: *Κονίασις· ἀσβέσιωσις*. (Notanda est vox *ἀσβέστωσις*, quam omisit H. Steph., omisit quoque Schneid.; utrumque præterit vox *ἀσβεστωσις*: Glossæ Labbeanæ: “*Ἀσβεστώσης· tofus*.” Verbum *ἀσβολαίνω* agnoscit Schneid. omisit H. Steph. Eadem Glossæ: “*Ἀσβολαίνεται· fuscatur*, P.”) At dices, quid sibi velint ista verba, *λειοκονίασις· κόνις διαλελυμένη*? Ad verba *κόνις διαλελυμένη* alium agunt silentium Hesychii interpretes; vox *διαλελυμένη* corrupta est: inter *κόνις* et *διαλελυμένη* nihil est commune: legendum ergo *διακεκλυμένη*. Verbum *διακλύζω* et H. Steph. et Schneid. agnoscit. *Κόνις διακεκλυμένη* dixit Hesych. in sensu verbi *κλύζειν inungere rice, cera oblinere* etc., de quo Lexica H. Steph. et Schneid. silent. Hesych. *Κεκώνισται· πεπίσσωται, κέκλυσται*. Theocritus I, 27. *Καὶ βαθὺ κισσύβιον κεκλυσμένον ἀδὲ καρῶν, cera oblitum poculum*, ubi Schol. rectissime: *Κεκλυσμένον· ἤρουν λελουμένον κηρῶν, κεχρισμένον, ὃ κεκονισμένον οἱ κοινοὶ φασιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ κλύζω· λέγεται δὲ τὸ κλύζειν, ἐπὶ δύο· ἐπὶ τε τοῦ διὰ κλυστῆρος ἱατρικῆς, καὶ ἐφ’ ὑγρᾶν, ὅταν τι ἐπέρχωνται καὶ ἐπικλύπτωσι. καθὼ λήγεται ἐνταῦθα*. H. Steph. e Galeno affert *ἐκκλύζω τῇ κονίᾳ*, quod minus recte interpretari videtur *eluere*, sed Galenus præsto nobis non adest. Glossa igitur Hesych. in hunc modum forte refigenda et explicanda est: *Λειοκονίασις· ἡ τελείωσις, κόνις διακεκλυμένη· λείως γὰρ τελείως*.¹ *Λειοκονίασις* est

τελείως supra egimus.) Valcken. ad Albertium sic aliquando perscripsit de Hesychii glossa: “*Λείως est ξαδίως*: cetera pertinent ad *ἀνοσίμως* (v. Suid.), quæ semel juncta a Platone in Theæteto p. 144. B. ubi vid. Serran.: hæc ergo simul exposita in Lexico Platónico descripsit Hesych. sub una voce *λείως*.” Locus Platonis est p. m. 107, C. *ὁ δὲ οὕτω λείως τε καὶ ἀπταίστως καὶ ἀνοσίμως ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὰς μεθήσεις*. Abreschius vocem *λείως* eruit e Basil. III. Hexaem. p. 25. B. *ὅλον ἀκριβῶς ἔντονον, καὶ λείως περιηγμένον*. Nos Plutarchi afferemus locum: *Λείως καὶ μετ’ ὑγανίας προσδοκᾶται κοινωνίαν τινα*, VI, 364, 7: ed. Reiske.

¹ Hesychii etymologiæ obstare videtur, quod vox scribitur *λειοκονίασις*, non *λειώκονίασις*: nam, si vox derivaretur e v. *λείως*, scribendum esset *λειώκονίασις*, non per *ο* parvum, ut in vocibus e *λείως* compositis, scribitur

proprie ἰ. q. κονία τελεία, διακεκλυσμένη, *tectorium vel calx satis oblita, et jam ad usum parata*, unde per metaphoram denotare videtur τὴν τελείωσιν. Veteres grammatici, ut et scriptores veteres ipsi, κονία et κονίς pro eodem aliquando accipiunt: Hesych. κόνις· τέφρα, σποδός: Κονία· σμῆμα, σποδός.

Nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. agnoscit κωνέω ἰ. e. *pice inungere*. Sed lexicographos veteres, cum κωνῆσαι exponant per πισσοκοπήσαι, de verbo κωνέω, non de v. κωνάω, vel voluisse dicere, vel debuisse, manifestum est ἐ Schol. Aristoph., quem H. Steph. Ind. v. Περι-κωνέω adduxit: “Περικωνέω, *circumcirca illino*, Aristoph. Vesp. Τὸν σπόγγον ἔχων ἐκ τῆς λεκάνης τὰμβάδι’ ἡμῶν περικωνεῖ, ἰ. e. διὰ κολακσίαν τὰ ὑποδήματα ἡμῶν τῶν ὑικιστῶν ἀποψᾶ καὶ ἀλείφει, inquit Schol. qui metaphoram esse dicit a vasis; proprie enim περικωνῆσαι esse τὸ πισσῶσαι τὰ κεράμια, *pice oblinere*, seu *picare vasa fictilia*. Hesych. quoque περικωνῆσαι expr. στοιγγίται et περιπισσῶσαι, Laconicum esse verbum annotans.” Idem H. Steph., (ut et Schneid.,) qui περικωνέω, *circumcirca illino*, agnoscit, κωνάω, (non κωνέω), *pice inungo*, recepit, quasi simplex esset κωνάω, compositum περικωνέω. Ut supra diximus, κωνᾶν est στρέφειν, περιβιβεῖν, περινεύγειν, at κωνεῖν, quod verbum Lexicis est commendandum, est πισσῶσαι. Hesych. non dicit: κωνεῖν πισσοκοπεῖν καὶ κύκλῳ περιφέρειν: sed κωνῆσαι πισσοκοπήσαι, καὶ κύκλῳ περινεύγειν: eodemque modo nec Etym. M. nec Suidas habet κωνεῖν, sed tantum κωνῆσαι: hoc κωνῆσαι, ambigue dictum, H. Steph. et Schneid. accipiunt pro aor. a v. κωνάω, cum est a κωνέω, ut patet ex Aristoph. περικωνεῖ, et ejus Schol. Κωνῶν, ἰ. e. *pice inungere*, e Lexicis expellendum est. Schneiderus: “Πισσοκωνέω ich verpiche, auch πισσοκωνέω oder πισσοκωνάω.” H. Steph. Thes. III, p. 330.: “Πισσοκωνάω, *pice oblinō*, seu *circumlino*.” Πισσοκωνάω est vox nihili: scribe, πιστοκωνέω. Notandum est Salmasium in nota infra laudanda rectissime scribere κωνεῖν, non κωνᾶν. Verbum ἐκκωνεῖν non agnoscunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Sed exstat in corrupta Hesychii glossa: Ἐκκωνεῖ· ἐγχωρεῖ: ubi male egit Heins.: “Ἰσως, Ἐκκωνεῖ· ἐκχωρεῖ: nam οἱ ἐκχωροῦντες h. e. πλανῶντες inter venandum, ἐκκυνοὶ Xenoph. Cyneg., τελευτῶσαι, inquit, γίνονται ἐκκυνοὶ, πονηρὸν πάθημα.” optime restituit J. Voss. legendo, Ἐκκωνεῖ· ἐγχρίει.

λειωκόρητος, non λειωκόρητος: λειωνότιος, non λειονότιος. Literarum series nos vetat h. l. λειωνοίσις scribere, quia sequens glossa est: Λῆον· ὁ εἶδος ἢ ὁμοίαν. An λειο in λειονοίσις pertineat ad τὸ λῆον, qui H. Stephano in v. est pulvis Aristot. 4. De Hist. Anim., et Salmasio in Solin. p. 868. A. i. q. *tectorium* (‘*Livum parietis* a p. Jurisconsultum pro *tectorio*, τὸ λῆον, ut olim docuimus rescribendum pro *rinum*’), alii viderint.

‘Nescio qua auctoritate fretus Hesychius “Laconicum esse verbum annotet;” nam et Aristophanes eo usus est.

Græcos scriptores non modo *κωνεῖν*, *περικωνεῖν*, i. e. *pice inungere*, usurpasse, sed et *κωνίζεῖν* eodem dixisse sensu, abunde testantur Hesychii loca supra adducta.

Infra a Salmasio demonstrabitur eodem et *κωνίζεῖν* et *κονίζεῖν* uno eodemque dixisse sensu. Inde fit, ut in uno Hesychii loco sit scriptum *πισσοκονία*, in altero autem *πισσοκωνία*: Hesych. v. *κωνήσαι* scribit: *Πισσοκονία ἢ νῦν πισιδία (πισσία), ἣ χρίουσι τὰ παρίσθμια τῶν προβάτων*, ubi Albertius male legit *πισσοκωνία*: nam Hesych. h. l. scripsisse *πισσοκονία*, manifestum est e præcedentibus verbis, ubi *Æschyli φράσιν* affert, *πισσοκόνιτον μόρον*. Idem tamen Hesychius in altero loco habet: *Πισσοκωνίας, Ἡρόδοτος πισσοκωνίαν εἶπεν, διὰ τὸ τὰ πρόβατα πίσσῃ χρίσθαι.* Vocem *πισσοκονία*, sive *πισσοκωνία*, omisit H. Steph. De ea Schneiderus: “*Πισσοκονία, auch πισσοκωνία, das verpichen, von πίσσα, pech, u. κῶνος, flussiges pech, oder κονία, wie ἄμμοκονία, ὄστρακονία.*”

Vel Theocritus I, 30. *κεκονισμένος* usurpavit pro *κεκωνισμένος*:

Τῷ περὶ μὲν χεῖλῃ μαρύνεται ὕψοθι κισσός.

Κισσὸς ἐλιχρύτῃ κεκονισμένος:

optime exposuit Salmas. loco infra laudando: “*Hedera poculum illud ambiebat per extremas oras; quæ hedera lita auripigmento fuit, ut κισσὸς χρυσόκαρπος exprimeretur.*” Bene Schol. *Κονία, ἢ ἄσβεστος, ἀφ’ οὗ κονίαλον κονίω, τὸ ἄσβεστω χρίω, καὶ κεκονισμένος τοῖχος, ὁ ἄσβεστω κεχρισμένος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ κεκονισμένος, ἴσως ἀντὶ τοῦ κεχρισμένος ἀπλῶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ κεκονισμένος κατὰ συγχοπὴν.* Cetera accuratus, fallitur Schol. credens *κεκονισμένος* poni pro *κεκονισμένος*, κατὰ συγχοπὴν. cum revera ponitur pro *κεκωνισμένος*. “*Κονίω sive κονίζω, obliño, proprie obliño pulvere, χρίω, ut Suid. exponit: at Hesychio κονιόντες sunt λευκαίνοντες, albario opere, seu calce inducentes: item pice, pice obliño: unde ἀκόνιτος Dioscoridi ἀπίσσωτος: pro χρίω autem accipi videtur Scholiastæ Theocriti Id. I. (l. c.).*” H. Steph. *Thes. II, 935, F.* Fallitur H. Steph., cum putet *κονίω* sive *κονίζω* esse proprie *obliño pulvere*, deinde generatim *obliño, χρίω. Κονίζω* usurpatum pro *obliño pulvere*, qui H. Stephano hujus vocis primarius sensus est, nondum invenimus. *Κονίζω*, cum a *κόνις, pulvis*, originem trahat, notat *pulvere impleo, respergo, fido*: at, cum pro *κωνίζω*, ponatur, nihil ei commune est cum vocabulo *κόνις*, i. e. *pulvis*, sed omnes habet sensus, qui verbo *κωνίζω* insunt, sc. *pice obliño, cera*

¹ Ubi Albertius:—“In Herodoto locum frustra quæres; nec alibi vocem me legere memini. Quum vero Grammaticum redoleat hic articulus pro *Ἡρόδοτος*, leg. suspicor *Ἡρόδοτος*, quem inter nobiliores Homeri interpretes cum Apione sæpius junctum laudat Eustath.; vel *Ἡροδιανός*, de quo in Epist. ad Eulogium, huic libro præmissa. *Herodoti* enim, *Herodori*, ac *Herodiani* nomina non raro in libris confusa esse, norunt satis eruditi, quod multis exemplis comprobavit P. Wes-seling. in *Diss. Herodoti*. c. 3, et 4.”

oblino, generatim *oblino*, et *χρίω*. Utrum *κονίζω* pro *κωνίζω* idem sibi vindicet etymon, quod *κωνίζω*, a *κῶνος*, *pix*, an sit e *κόνις*, *pulvis*, alii viderint. Glossæ Labbeanz: *Κόνις ciner, cinis, pulvis, lix, lixivum*. Sed scribit Salmas. in Solin. p. 868. "Ut igitur *κονίσαι* pro *κωνίσαι*, ita *κονία* pro *κωνία*, ἢ *χρίσις*, quo sensu et *calx* ita dicitur, quo linebant et inducebant parietes: nulla in hac voce *cineris*, aut *lixivi* significatio, ut vulgo sibi persuadent harum literarum imperiti." At, quanquam Salmasio demus in "voce *κωνία*, sive *κονία*, nullam esse *cineris*, aut *lixivi* (i. e. *κόνεως*) significationem," tamen non continuo sequitur vocem *κόνις* nunquam accipi debere pro *κονία*, sive *κωνία*, i. e. *χρίσις*, et verb. *κονίζειν* pro *κωνίζειν*, i. e. *oblinere*, nequicquam venire a *κόνις* i. e. *pulvis*. Supra vidimus Hesych. et *κόνις* et *κονία* exponere per *σποδός*, et si *κόνις* et *κονία* accipiantur pro eadem re sc. *σποδός*, cur non *κόνις*, i. e. *pulvis*, aliquando per errorem pro *κονία*, sive *κωνία*, i. e. *calx*, *χρίτις*, putemus? Salmas. l. c. aliter sentit:—"Κονία, cum *calcem* significat, τὴν κονίασιν, vel *χρίσιν* proprie, l. c. tectorium denotat, quod diversæ est notionis et originis quam *κονία*, quæ cinerem, vel *στακὴν* designat, unde et *κόνις*, *pulvis*, *cinis*." J. N. Niclas ad Geoponica XI, 20, 3. sic scribit:—"Κονία et *κόνις* est *pulvis*, *calx*, unde *κονιάω* et *κονίζω*, *calce illino*, *pulvere spargo*: *κῶνος* vero est *strobilus*, *pix*, unde *κωνίζω*, *pice ungo*. Neque vero Theocritus *κεκωνισμένον* posuit pro *κεκωνισμένον*, ut vult Salmas.: nam *κεκωνισμένον* ibi est *pulvere auripigmenti sparsum*, ab *κόνις*, *pulvis*, non a *κῶνος*, *pix*." Quod ad Theocriti locum attinet, nostram sententiam, cujus auctor est Salmasius, supra declaravimus. Fallitur Niclas, qui censeat *κονίζω* et *κωνίζω* nihil inter se commune habere: nam modo demonstravimus *κονίζω* interdum occurrere in sensu τοῦ κωνίζω, et hoc luce clarius fecit Salmas. in loco, ad quem Niclas respicit, et quem fugientibus oculis legisse videtur.

Sed totus Niclasii locus notatu dignus est:—"Geoponica XI, 20, 3. εἰς ἀγγεῖα κεράμια νέα ἀκούνιστα, τοιτέστιν ἀπίσσωτα: Ἀκόνιστα conjecerat v. d. ad marginem Fabricianum; sed hoc nimis recedit a vulgatæ lectionis similitudine; itaque malim ἀκῶνιστα. Κῶνος est *pix liquida*: Diosc. I, 94. Πίσσα ἡ μὲν ὑγρὰ, ἣν ἐνοιοῦ κῶνον καλοῦσιν: inde κῶνα in Glossis Iatricis Mss. Neophyti ap. Dufresnium eadem significatione. Α κῶνος duo formantur verba, *κωνάω*, unde *κωνῆσαι*, *instar turbinis convertere*, et *κωνίζω*, *pice inungo*. Hesych. Διακωνῆσαι διακλαῦσαι (f. διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ κωνῆσαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν, πίσση χρίσαι: ubi vid. vv. dd. Idem Hesych. Κεκῶνισται πεπίσσωται, κίκλυσται. Inde igitur ἀκόνιστος, ex quo librarii imperiti tanto facilius ἀκούνιστος facere potuerunt, quoniam non modo alias quoque *οῦ* et *ῶ* permutant, ut *κῶφος* et *κῶφος*, de quo Valcken. Anim. ad Ammon. p. 134., sed etiam quod ἀκούνιστος, κούνισμα, κουνισμένος, etc. verba sunt barbaræ Græciæ familiarissimæ,

pro *movere, quaterere, vacillare, titubare*, α κούνια, *cunæ, vannus, etc.* Nunc demum video Salmas. ad Solin. p. 868. ἀκόνιστα emendasse. Nam nostrum locum ab eo designari non dubito. Ipse loquatur : 'Græci posteriores κονίαν pro κωνίαν dixere—eodem sensu dixerunt et κωνίζειν, et pro eo κονίζειν : in Geponicis, ἐν ἀκόνιστῳ πίθῳ, τυυτέστιν ἀπιστάτῳ, quod pice non est oblitum.' Hoc maneat itaque aut legendum esse ἀκόνιστα : nam οὐ et ὀ quam sæpe permutantur, vix dici potest : cf. Casaub. ad Athen. II, 5. et criticos ad Hesych. vv. ἐπιβουλεύει et συμβουλεύς : aut ἀκόνιστα, quod aliæ suadent rationes : nempe nomina et verba sunt diversa : κονία et κόνις est *pulvis, calx*, unde κονιάω et κονίζω, *calce illino, pulvere spargo*. Κῶνος vero est *strobilus, pice*, unde κονίζω, *pice ungo*. Neque vero Theocritus κεκονισμένον posuit pro κεκωνισμένον, ut vult Salmas. ; nam κεκονισμένον ibi est *pulver auripigmenti sparsum*, ab κόνις, *pulvis*, non a κῶνος, *pice*." Utrum in Geopon. legas cum Salmasio ἀκόνιστα, an cum Niclasio ἀκώνιστα, an cum Needhamo ἀκώνητα, nihil interest : sensus est idem : sed Salmasiana lectio ἀκόνιστα præferenda est, quoniam, ut erudite et accurate observat Salmas. l. c., Græci posteriores κονίαν pro κωνίαν, et κωνίζειν pro κονίζειν dixere.

Schneid. in Lex. v. 'Ακόνιτος : "Nicht verpicht oder mit Pech überzogen, (wo wir unsre irdene Gefässe glasiren) Diosc. I, 94. not. Sar. sollte eigentl. ἀκόνιστος, von κωνίζω, κῶνος no. 5. heissen. S. ἀκόνιτος nach." In v. 'Ακόνιστος scribit : "S. v. a. ἀκόνιτος, Geopon. XI, 20. S. κωνίζω nach." II. Steph. Thes. II, p. 335, F. : " 'Ακόνιτος Dioscoridi ἀπίσσωτος."

Fallitur Niclas, dicens "α κῶνος duo formari verba κωνάω, unde κωνῆσαι, *instar turbinis convertere*, et κωνίζω, *pice inungo*." Verbum κωνάω, *instar turbinis converto*, venit non a κῶνος, quæ est, teste Diosc. I, 94., πίσσα ὑγρὰ, (unde ap. Hesych. Κωνῆσαι· πισσοκοπῆσαι) sed a κῶνα, quæ est, teste Hesychio, βέμβιξ, unde ap. eund. Κωνῆν· περιδινεῖν : Κωνῆσαι· κύκλω, περινεγκεῖν : Περικωνῆσαι· περιρομβῆσαι, περιγαγεῖν : 'Εκῶνη· ἔστρεφεν, pro ἐκῶνα α κωνάω : 'Ανακωνᾶν· ἀναστρέφειν : legebatur h. l. ἀνακονεῖν, bene suspectum H. Steph. Ind. Thes. utpote non sua serie positum ; vv. dd. recte corrigunt ἀνακωνᾶν, quod verbum Lexicis est addendum. Α κῶνα, i. e. βέμβιξ, venit κανάξω, κωνάξω, Doribus, unde Epicharmi σκυφοκῶνακτος· τοῖς σκύφοις περιφόρητος ap. Hesych. : verbum κωνάξω omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid. ; H. Steph. omisit σκυφοκῶνακτος, quod Schneid. notavit in v. κωνάω, sed in proprio loco omisit : omiserunt quoque περικωνᾶν i. e., ut modo diximus, περιρομβῆσαι.

Ut Græci posteriores dicebant κονίζω pro κωνίζω, κονία pro κωνία, ἀκόνιστος pro ἀκώνιστος, sic "κόνιον pro κώνιον in Epigr. Diogenis, ut scriptum est in antiquissimo codice,

πρὸς γὰρ Ἰθθακίων κόνιον μὲν ἀπλῶς σὺ εἶδ' ἔω,
αὐτοὶ δ' ἐξέπιον τοῦτο τῷ στόματι,

de Socrate; ita etiam legit Suidas." Salmas. in Solin. p. 868. C. Suidæ locus est: Κόνειον· βοτάνη δηλητήριος, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ διὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ στίχου: ubi Kusterus monet: "Vel ex serie *literarum* patet, Suidam scribere voluisse, vel debuisset, κόνιον, per i." Diogenes κόνιον non usurpasset metri tantum gratia, ut Suidas existimabat, si, in isto Græcitatibus inferioris sæculo, κόνιον potius quam κώνειον non frequentassent scriptores. Κόνιον pro κώνειον omisit H. Steph., sed habet Schneid.: "Κόνιον, s. v. a κώνειον, Schierling, *cicuta*; bey Diog. Laert. II, 46. lesen die Handschr. u. Suidas, Πρὸς γὰρ Ἀθηναίων κόνιον μὲν ἀπλῶς σὺ ἐδέξω, wo jetzt κώνειον ἀπλῶς μὲν ἐδ. steht." In Epigrammate nihil est mutandum. Glossæ iatricæ Mss. Κόνιον· κηκοῦτα, i. e. *cicuta*: fallitur Albertius, qui mutat in κώνειον.¹ Græci dicebant κώνειον, κώνιον, κωνεία eodem sensu: κώνιον et κωνεία omisit H. Steph.: κωνεία omisit Schneid., sed agnoscit κώνειον, et κώνιον. Hesych. Κωνείαν· πᾶς εἶδος: Κώνιον· δηλητήριον, ἥτοι θανάσιμον, βοτάνη, h. l. κώνιον pro κώνειον *literarum* ordo postulat, ut vidit J. Voss. J. Pollux VIII, 71. de carnifice: Τὰ οὐ ἐργαλεῖα αὐτοῦ ξίφος, βρόχος, τύμπανον, φάρμακον, κώνειον: leg. κώνιον: "Mss. κώνιον," Jung.: iterum J. Pollux V, 132. τὸ γὰρ κώνειον κατὰ φύσιν ὀναιρεῖ: ubi Jung. "Ms. κόνειον," quod notandum potius quam ejiciendum.

Supra vidimus κῶνος esse, teste Dioscor. I, 94., πίσσα ὕγρα, unde ap. Hesych. κωνῆσαι· πισσοκοπήσαι. De v. κῶνος pro πίσσα ὕγρα, silet H. Steph., ut et Schneid. κῶνος proprie est ὁ στρόβιλος, *nux pinea*, tum *nucleus nucis pineæ*, ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός. Hesych. Κῶνοι· στρόβιλοι: Κῶνον· ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός, καὶ στρόβιλος: Κωνοφόρον· στρόβιλοφόρον. Homeri Vita c. 20., notante Pergero: Πλανώμενος ἀπῆκετο εἰς τὸ χωρίον, ὃ Πίτυς καλεῖται· κᾶνταῦθα αὐτῷ ἀναπαυομένῳ τὴν νύκτα ἐπιπίπτει καρπὸς τῆς πίτυος, ἐν δὲ μετεξέτεροι Στρόβιλον, οἱ δὲ Κῶνον καλοῦσιν. Glossæ Labbeanæ: "Κῶνος· *nucleus*: Κῶνοι· *nuclei*: Κωνοφόρος· *cunifer*." Docte scripsit Gesnerus Thes. L. L.: "Conus primo dictus videtur a Græcis fructus s. nux cupressorum, piceæ, et similium arborum, quæ inde *coniferæ* dicuntur: etiam Colum. VI, 7, 2. *conos cupressinos* vocat; *galbulos* R. R. I, 40, 1. Serv. ad Virg. Æn. III, 680. 'Et *conus* dicitur fructus cupressi, et ipsa κωνοειδής est; nam a rotunditate in acumen levatur.'" Ex his κῶνοις quia *pix liquida* fluebat, vox κῶνος, progressu temporis,

¹ Hesych. Ἐλάφιον· κώνιον: H. Steph. in v. h. l. affert. Nomen ἰλάφιον (proprie adjectivum, nomine subintellecto), omisit Schneid., ut et nom. ἐφήμερον eodem sensu. Hesych. Ἐφήμερον· τὸ κώνιον: ubi Albertius:—"Vid. Etym. M. v. Κώνιον et Salmas. Exerc. Plin. p. 171.: sic φάρμακον ἐφήμερον ap. Plut. Themist. p. 128. A., quod A. Gell. vi. 4. *venenum præsentaneum* vocat: cf. Gatak. ad M. Antonin. IV, 48. p. 132."

usurpabatur pro *pice liquida*, ut ap. Diosc. I, 94. Bene scribit Phot. Lex. Ms. ad v. Κωνῆσαι: Κώνους καλοῦσι τοὺς στροβίλους εἰκότως καὶ οἱ πιττοῦντες τὰ ἀγγεῖα, ἀπὸ τῆς περιαγωγῆς, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πιττώσεως. Per στροβίλους h. l. intelligendi sunt *coni*,¹ ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός.

Εἰν ὁ κώνος, i. e. ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός, nomen suum traxit κωνίας οἶνος: Galenus Gloss. Hippocr.: Κωνίαν οἶνον τὸν πισσίνην ἐσβάλλεται σὺν τῷ φλοιῷ τῆς πεύκης ἡμικοτύλιον εἰς τὸ κεράμειον, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπηθούσι μετὰ τὸ ζέσαι, οἱ δὲ καταλείπουσιν.

Εἰν ὁ κώνος, i. e. ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός, venit κῶνος i. e. ὁ θύρσος. Hesych. Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι. Suidas: Κωνοφόροι θυρσοφόροι κῶνος δὲ λέγεται ὁ βοτρυοειδὴς τοῦ στροβίλου καρπός, ὃν ἔφερον αἱ γυναῖκες βαστάζουσαι ἐν ταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου τελεταῖς, ἐπειδὴ ὅμοιον τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κώνου τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ, ἐπιστάτην δὲ φασιν Ἑλλήνες τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καρδίας τὸν Διόνυσον οἰκείῳ οὖν τινι μυστηρίῳ τοῦτο ἐποιοῦν. Schol. Mss. Cod. Moden. in Clem. Alex. Προτρ. p. 15. (ap. Bast. Gregor. p. 241.) Κῶνοι οἱ στρόβιλοι, καὶ οἱ θύρσοι, ὡς Διογενιανός, ῥόμβος, οἶνος: Κῶνος ξυλῆριον, οὗ ἐξήπται τὸ σπαρτίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἐδονεῖτο, ἵνα ροιζῇ. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ῥόμβος ἐκαλεῖτο οὕτω Διογενιανός. Hic Scholiastes hortulos suos irrigavit ex eodem flumine, quod libavit Hesych.: Ῥόμβος ψῆρος, στρόφος, ἤχος, ὕνος, κῶνος, ξυλῆριον, οὗ ἐξήπται σχοινίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς δινεῖται. (H. l. Albertus bene retinet ξυλῆριον, de qua voce H. Steph. II, 1142.

¹ Fallitur H. Steph., qui in v. Κῶνος scribit: "Κῶνοι, ut et στρεμβοὶ et στρόβιλοι, dicuntur turbines illi, quibus pueri ludunt, alio nomine βίμβηκας dicti." Eodem modo J. N. Niclas erravit, quem supra notavimus. Κῶνα est βίμβηξ, non κῶνος: Hesych. Κῶνα βεμβιξ. H. Steph. ad sequentem Hesychii glossam respicit, quam mirum est non intellexisse: Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι, καὶ στροβίλοι, καὶ οἱ στρέμβοι. Per στροβίλους καὶ στρέμβους intelligi debet ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός. Schol. ad Theocr. Idyll. V, 49. ἡ πίτυς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους στροβίλους ἀφίησιν. Hesych.: Κύτταροι καὶ τὰ τῆς πίτυος καὶ πίτυος προαινοῦντα στρεβίλια: cf. H. Steph. in v. Κύτταρος. (Notanda est vox στρεβίλιον, quod omisit H. Steph.: occurrit ap. J. Poll. V, 97., sed alio sensu: Ἐκαλιῦτο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Κωμικοῖς, καὶ ἐγκλαστῆρια, καὶ στρεβίλια, καὶ βοτρυδία: ubi Jung.: "Sc. quod similia essent τῷ τῆς πίτυος καρπῷ, τοῖς λεγομένοις (uti ex Etymologo patet in Φθίε) στρεβίλοις, et Hesych. στρόβιλοι inter alia explicat υἱὸς γυναικείων χενσίων.") "Στρέμβος i. q. κῶνος, vel στρόβιλος: Hesych. Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι καὶ οἱ στρεβίλοι, καὶ οἱ στρέμβοι. Nicander (Ther. 883.) στρέμβους etiam posuit pro nucibus pineis, qui et κῶνοι proprie:

οὐδ' ὅσα πύκααι

ἀγροτέραι στρέμβουσιν ὑπερέψαντο ναπαίαις.

ad quem locum Schol. exponit στρέμβοι, τὸν καινοειδῆ καρπὸν τῆς πίτυος." Salmas. in Solin. p. 907. Cf. H. Steph. Thes. III, p. 1106. F. Est sensus astronomicus vocis κῶνος, quem non notavit H. Steph. Suidas Κῶνοι στρόβιλοι, καὶ τὸ ἀποσπίασμα τῆς γῆς.

C. dubitaverat, sed quæ omnino defendi possit e *ξύλαριον* Scholiastæ modo citati.)

Notandus est magnus veterum grammaticorum, ut Hesych. et Schol. in Clem. Alex. ll. cc., error, qui *κῶνον* in Bacchi ritibus usurpatum cum *ῥόμβω* ad eosdem ritus adhibito confundunt. *Κῶνος* est ὁ *θύρσος*, at *ῥόμβος* non est ὁ *θύρσος*, sive *κῶνος*. *Κῶνος* ut Suidas l. c. optime explicat, est fructus pini, racemum figura referens, quem mulieres in sacris Bacchi gestabant in pertica summa fixum, ut patet ex Epigrammatis versu, quem adduxit Suidas :

Καὶ θύρσου χλοερὸν κωνοφόρον κάμακα.¹

Pertica illa nihil aliud erat quam *κλάδος*, unde in Epigr. *χλοερὸν κάμακα* : hinc *θύρσος* explicatur *κλάδος* : Suidas, *θύρσος* βακχικὴ ῥάβδος. Hesych. *θύρσος* ῥάβδος, βακτηρία βακχικὴ, ἢ κλάδος : *θύρσοι* κλάδοι. Proprie *θύρσος* est *κλάδος*, sive *χλοερὸς κάμαξ κωνοφόρος* : improprie ergo sumitur *κῶνος* pro *θύρσος*, id quod revera in pertica fixum pro pertica ipsa. Sed *ῥόμβος* de iisdem Bacchi ritibus usurpatus longe alio dicitur sensu quam *κῶνος*, sive *θύρσος*.

ἔνθεν εἰσαίει

ῥόμβω καὶ τυπάνῳ Πείην Φρύγες ἰλάσκονται :

Apoll. R. I. 1139.

¹ De *θύρσοις* insignis est Salmasii Epistola, ad Du Puy. A. 1628. scripta, ubi idem epitheton *κωνοφόρος* *θύρσος* ex Orphei versu ap. Clem. Alex. " Je vous renvoye la lettre de Monsr. Peyresc, et vous en remercie, comme je luy fais pour les remarques de l'antiquité, qu'il a daigné rechercher si curieusement à mon subject. Quant aux *Thyrse* Bacchiques, il faut necessairement qu'il y en ait eu de deux sortes, et les Auteurs anciens en marquent la difference. Les uns estoient tout entortillés de papier et de feuilles de lierre ; Anacreon les appelle *κατακίσσους* *θύρσους*, i. e. *hedera inductos thyrse*. Il s'en voit de cette façon dans l'Agathe gravée, qui est aut devant du Perse de Casaubon, et dans son livre *De Satyra*, et qui est expliquée par Scaliger en l'une de ses Epistres. Elle a pour argument les mysteres ou orgies de Bacchus, et une bacchante y tient un thyrses, fait en la façon que je dis. C'est un baton simple qui a du lierre à l'entour. En quelques uns le bout du javelot estoit envelopé de feuilles de vigne ou de lierre, et en ce sens Macrobe interprete *thyrsus, hastam, vel jaculum, cujus mucro hedera lambente obtectus est*. Les Grecs les appellent *λογχοτοὺς* *θύρσους*, ou *θυρολόγχους*. Quant aux autres remarques par le dit Sr. Peyresc, c'estoient des batons au bout desquels il y avoit une pomme de pin, qui estoit entre les jouets de Bacchus, comme il se voit dans un vers d'Orphée chez Clement Alexandrin, où entre les jouets de Bacchus estant encore enfant il nomme *κάνους*, qui sont des pommes de pin ; et de la vient que les Bacchantes les portoient au bout de leurs batons, qu'ils appelloient *θύρσους κωνοφόρους*. J'expliqueray cela en mes Prolegomenes." Salmasii Epist. XII. Lib. I. Confer Plin. Exercit. in Solin. p. 908. De Homonym. Hyles latr. p. 3, 5.

ubi Schol. 'Ρόμβος δέ ἐστι τροχίσκος, ὃν στρέφουσιν ἱμάσι τύπτοντες, καὶ οὕτω κύπτον ἀποτελοῦσιν: Phot. Lex. Ms. 'Ρόμβος, ὃν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἀποθειάζοντες, ὡς τὸ τύμπανον: Archytas H. Steph. *Excerpt.* p. 84. Καὶ τοῖς ρόμβοις, τοῖς ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς κινουμένοις τὸ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει' ἡσυχὰ μὲν κινούμενοι βαρὺν ἀφίεντι ἄχον, ἰσχυρῶς δὲ ὀξύν. Viri doctissimi, ut ostendemus alibi in peculiari Dissertatione de v. 'Ρόμβος ejusque multiplici sensu, *rhombum sacrum* confundunt et cum *magico rhombo* (de quo Theocritus), et cum *puerorum turbine*, ab Homero et vetustioribus scriptoribus *στρομβῶν*, et a posterioribus demum Græcis *ρόμβω*, appellato. In Epigrammate, ad quod allusit Suidas, scriptor rectissime distinguit *ρόμβον*, *θύρσον*, et *κῶνον*. Kusterus ad Suid. v. *Θίασος* c Ms. edidit:

Στρεπτὸν Βασσαρικοῦ ρόμβον θιάσοιο μύωπα,
καὶ σκύλος ἀμφιδόρου στικτὸν ἀχαίνεω,
καὶ Κορυβαντεῖων ἰαχήματα χάλκεα ρόπτρων,
καὶ θύρσου χλοερὸν κωνοφόρον καμακα,
καὶ κορύφαιο βαρὺν τυπάνου βρόμον, ἥδ' ἐ φορηθὲν
πολλάκι μιτροδέτου λίχνον ὑπερβὲ κόμης,
Εὐάνθη Βάκχῃ τὴν ἔντρομον, ἀνίκα θύρσοις
ἄτρυμον εἰς προπόσεις χεῖρα μετημφίασεν.

Addit Kusterus:—"Evanthe Baccho dedicat instrumenta, quibus antea in celebrandis Dei illius orgiis usa fuerat, veluti rhombum, thyrsum, pellem cervinam, vannum, et tympanum." In v. *Βρόμος* pro καὶ κορύφαιο Suidas habet καὶ κούφοιο.

Salmasii locus, quem sæpenumero supra laudavimus, est hic:—"Observanda differentia *albarii* operis et *tectorii*: *tectorium* fit harenata calce, vel marmorato; *albarium* calce mera. Vitruvius, *Tectorio, sive albario opere*. Et alio loco *album opus* appellat. Inde *albini* et *albarii*, qui dealbant. Proprium verbum hujus operis *dealbare*, ut *tectorii linere* et *polire*. Græci *κονιάτας* vocant *tam* albarios, quam tectores. Hesych.: *κονιῶντες*: λευκαίνοντες: *ἐτ κονιαταί*: ἀσβεστωταὶ καὶ χρίται: item, *κονιάσις*: ἀσβεστώσις, Lat. *decalecatio*. Ita enim veteres loquuti: Festus: *Decalecata ædificia, calce polita*, κεκονιαμένα, ἡσβεστωμένα: item, *decalecatum, calce litum*. Ita in vetustissimo libro scriptum reperi. *Κονία*,

* Hesychius ipse habet non *ἀσβεστωταί*, sed *ἀσβεστήριαι*: neutrum agnoscunt H. Steph. et Schneid.: an recte omittant, alii viderint: de Salmasiana lectione *ἀσβεστωταί* silet Albertius, sed de v. *χρίται* scribit: "L. *χρίσται*: Glossæ, *χρίσταις*: ὁ *κονιάτης, tector*." Nec *χρίσται*, nec *χρίται* agnoscit H. Steph.: de v. *χρίταις* silet Schneid., sed e Glossis habet *χρίσταις*. Voc. *διὰ χρίταις* a Salmasio infra memoratum non habent H. Steph. et Schneid.

vetustis Glossis *calx* exponitur. Item in Græcis: *Κονία* ἀσβεστος. Sed *κονία* cum *calcem* significat, τὴν *κονίαν* vel *χρίσιν* proprie, h. e. *tectorium* denotat. Quod diversæ est notionis et originis quam *κονία*, quæ *cinerem*, vel *στακτήν* designat, unde et *κόνις*, *pulvis*, *cinis*. At *κονία* pro *tectorio* vel *calce* i. q. *χρίσις*. Unde *κατάχριστοι τοῖχοι*, *tectorio inducti parietes*, et *κατάχριστοι*, *recens dealbati* ap. Dioscor. Ad eam rem præcipuus usus calcis. *Κωνία* veteres dicebant, quod est *διάχρισιν*. Nam et *κωνεῖν*, pro *χρίειν*. Unde *πισσοκωνῆσαι*, *pice lincre*, et *πισσοκωνῆσθαι* μόρῳ ap. Aischylum, ὅταν πίση καταχρισθέντες τινες ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀποθάνωσιν. Inde *κωνήσις* ap. Aristotelem in alveis arum, quam alii *κόμωσιν* dicebant. Grammatici exponunt *διάχρισιν* τοῦ σμήνους. Ex eo ἀκωνήτων ἀγγείων ap. Dioscor. *vas non picatum*. Ita enim leg. de fuligine resinæ: εἰς κεραμεῦν ἀγγεῖον ἀκωνήτων, τούτεστιν ἀπίσσωτον. Et ap. Suid. *κωνῆσαι* πίθον, *picare dolium*. Græci posteriores *κονίαν* pro *κωνίαν* dixere. Sic *κόνιον* pro *κώνειον* in Epigr. Diogenis, ut scriptum est in antiquissimo Codice:

πρὸς γὰρ Ἀθηναίων κόνιον μὲν ἀπλῶς σὺ ἐδέξω,
αὐτοὶ δ' ἐξέπιον τοῦτο τεφρὸ στόματι,

de Socrate: ita etiam legit Suidas. *Πισσοκωνία* ap. Herod., ἡ διὰ πίσης χρίσις: alii *πισσοκονίαν* vocarunt per ο parvum. Hesych. *πισσοκονία* ἡ νῦν πισθία, δι' ἧς χρίουσι τὰ παρίσθμια τῶν προβάτων. Eodem sensu dixerunt et *κωνίζειν*, et pro eo *κονίζειν*. In Geponicis, ἐν ἀκονίστῳ πίθῳ, τούτεστιν ἀπισσύτῳ, quod *pice non est oblitum*. Hesych. *κεκωνίσται* πεπίσσωται, *κέκλυται*: Theocr. *κεκονισμένον* posuit pro *κεκωνισμένον*:

Κισσὸς ἐλιχρύσῳ κεκωνισμένος.

Qui versus longe aliter exponendus, ac vulgo interpretes accipiunt. Hedera poculum illud ambiebat per extremas oras. Quæ hedera lita auripigmento fuit, ut *κισσὸς χρυσόκαρπος* exprimeretur. *Ἐλιχρύσος*, *auripigmentum*: Hesych. *ἐλιχρύσος*, οἱ μὲν τὸ ἀρσενικόν, οἱ δὲ τὸ ἄνθος ἐλιχρύσου βοτάνης. Quod autem Hesych. *κεκωνίσται*, *κέκλυται* interpretatur, in hac eadem significatione posuit Theocritus: *κισσύβιον κέκλυσμένον ἀδεῖ καρῷ*, *cera oblitum poculum*. Ut igitur *κονίσαι* pro *κωνίσαι*, ita *κονία* pro *κωνία*, ἢ *χρίσις*. Quo sensu et *calx* ita dicitur, quo linebant et inducebant parietes. Nulla in h. v. cineris, aut lixivi significatio, ut vulgo sibi persuadent harum literarum imperiti." Salmas. in Solin. p. 868.

E supra dictis liquido patet, Valckenærium falli, cum Salmasium corrigere velit, ad Theocritum I, 30. *Κισσὸς ἐλιχρύσῳ κεκωνισμένος*, his verbis:—"Hunc locum tractans Salmasius in Solin. p. 1229, A. *κωνεῖν*, vel *κονίζειν*, et *κονεῖν*, vel *κωνεῖν*, diversa confudit. Vera est observatio Eustathii in Hom. Il. γ. p. 289, 38. (et in Il. ε, p. 1153, 13.): Ὁμηρὸς μὲν κωνὴν λέγει τὴν ἀπλῶς κόνιν· οἱ δὲ μεθ'

"Ὀμηρον, τὴν τίτανον" ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἐλαιοκονία σύγκειται· καὶ ῥῆμα γίνεται—*κονίω κονιάσω*· ἐξ οὗ καὶ τοῖχος κεκονιαμένος. *Κονίζειν* est *pulverem adspargere*; *κονίαν*, *calce illinere*: de Templo Neptuni, cujus *parietes* erant *interiores calce dealbati*, *κεκονιάται* τὰ ἐντὸς, inquit Pausan. X, p. 892, I. *Τοῖχοι κεκονισμένοι parietes essent pulvere conspersi*. Sed amplificatam verbi vim quomodocunque *adspargendi* voces adjectæ determinant: hoc in loco, *κισσὸς ἐλιχέουσφ κεκονισμένος*, est *hedera auri pigmento velut adspersa exornata*." Non Salmasius ipse, ut critico summo videtur, sed Græci recentiores, ut Salmasius, et nos post Salmasium plurimis exemplis ostendimus, *κονίσιν* et *κονίζειν*. *κονίαν* et *κωνίαν* confuderunt.

Fr. Guil. Sturzius de Dial. Maced. et Alex. p. 175., quod mirum est, nullam Valckenærianæ notæ mentionem fecit, recte tamen et *κονίσιν* et *κονίζειν* pro *χρίειν* usurpatum recentiori tribuit Græcitati, ut ante Sturzium fecerat Salmasius, cujus locus eum præteriiit. "*Κονίσιν* sive *κονίζειν*, ubi simpliciter pro *χρίειν* dictum fuit, non tulit Gr. linguæ puritas. Schol. Theocr. ad I, 27. *κεκλυσμένον, ἥγουν λελουμένον, κεχρισμένον, ὃ κεκονισμένον οἱ κοινοὶ φασιν*: deinde ad v. 30., ubi poeta *κεκονισμένος ἴσως ἀντὶ τοῦ κεχρισμένος ἀπλῶς*."

REMARKS ON

POETÆ MINORES GRÆCI, *Præcipua Lectionis Varietate et Indicibus Locupletissimis instruxit* THOMAS GAISFORD, A. M. *Ædis Christi Alumnus, necnon Græcæ Linguae Professor Regius*. Vol. I. Oxonii, e Typographico Clarendoniano. MDCCCXIV.

WHILE we admire the learning, the accuracy, and the taste of Professor GAISFORD, in this publication, which is certainly the *editio palmaria*, we cannot but lament that he had not, at the time when he was engaged in preparing for the press the *Poetæ Minores*, met with the *Miscellanea Philologica*, edited by A. Matthiæ, of which a Second Edition appeared in 1809, as he would have found in the excellent Dissertation of Huschke "de Fabulis Archilochi" much matter connected with Hesiod and Archilochus. Huschke has in p. 5. Vol. I. introduced an emendation of Hesiod, Opp. v. 201, which will, we think, meet with Mr. G.'s approbation, as it is founded on the authority of an Etym. Ms.:

Νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσ' ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς.

ᾧδ' ἱρῆε προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον.

"In hac tam facili narratione ferendam non esse duram istam a versu primo ad secundum orationis progressionem, nemo, semel monitus, facile negabit. Sed hæc librariorum est, non Hesiodi

culpa: nempe legendum est ὡς ἱρηξ (pro ᾧδ' ἱρηξ.) Hoc dicendi genere ubique utuntur Gr. scriptores in commemorandis fabulis Æsopis, velut Aristoph. Vesp. 1448.:

ὁ δ' ἔλεξεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ὁ κάναθαρός ποτε:

ibid. v. 1181.:

ἐγὰρ δα τοῖνον τῶν γε πάνυ κατ' οἰκίαν
ἐκείνον, ὡς οὕτω ποτ' ἦν μῦς καὶ γαλῇ:

adde v. 1177.:

πρῶτον μὲν, ὡς ἡ Ἀμύ' ἀλοῦσ' ἐπέρδετο·
ἐπειτα δ', ὡς ὁ Καρδοπίων τὴν μητέρα.

“Nunc fragmenta fabularum Archilochearum cum versibus Hesiodicis ex Etym. Ms. describamus. Αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αἶνός ἐστι λόγος κατ' ἀναπόλησιν μυθικὴν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῶων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εἰρημένος· οἶον ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων ζῶων, ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀρχιλόχος· Αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ ἡ (ἡδ') ἀετὸς ξυνω-
νίαν ἔθεντο. Καὶ ἄλλως· Τὸ δὲ ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλέη συνήντο τὸ πικνὸν ἔχουσα νόον (h. e. Τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλέη συνήντητο πικνὸν ε. v.) Καὶ Ἰσιόδης· Νῦν δ' αἶνον, βασιλεὺς ἐρέω νοέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς, ὧς δ' ἱρηξ προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον.

“Ex h. l. nihil aliud lucramur, nisi confirmationem emendationis in Hesiodo proposita. Nam Archilochi fragmenta alibi accuratius descripta leguntur, ut ap. Ammon. in v. Αἶνος, quibus insigne additamentum infra adjicietur, quod sese querentibus nobis nunc ipsum offert.”

In the above extract from the Etym. MS. Mr. G. will notice an additional authority for the epithet ποικιλόδειρον as applied to ἀηδόνα, about which Ruhnken, whose note Mr. G. has cited, entertained some unnecessary scruples:

“Atqui,” says Ruhnken, “lusciniā non est ποικιλόδειρος, sed χλωραύχην. Simonides ap. Etym. M. p. 813, 8. Eustath. Od. T. p. 1875. εὖτ' ἀηδόνες πολυκώτιλοι, χλωραύχενες, εἰαριναί. Quæ fortasse causa fuit cur Tzetzes et Moschopolus ποικιλόδειρος, sine exemplo, ποικιλόφωνος explicarent. Sed vix dubito, quin affinis sonus literarum εἰ et η, qui tot menda peperit, huic etiam loco corrumpendo occasionem dederit. Lege ποικιλόγην. Epigr. ap. Gruter. p. 1118, 9. τὴν κυανᾶπιν Μοῦσαν ἀηδόνα τὴν μελίγην. Theocr. Ep. iv. 11, 12. Philippus Anal. Brunck. T. ii. p. 221. Nec tamen reticere debeo, vulgatam scripturam magnis patronis viti, Ammonio v. αἶνος, Theone Progymn. p. 31. Nonno xxvi. p. 688. xlvii. p. 1204. Huc accedit, quod lusciniā, auctore Clemente Alex. Pæd. ii. 10. p. 221. cum voce etiam colorem mutat: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀηδὼν καὶ τὸ χρῶμα καὶ τὴν φθὴν συµμεταβάλλει ταῖς τροπαῖς.”

We are not persuaded that a lection, so remote in its meaning from the common notion about the nightingale as ποικιλόδειρος, can have been substituted by illiterate transcribers for the obvious

epithet ποικιλόγηρον, and in our opinion the passage from Clem. Alex., adduced by Ruhken, is quite sufficient to vindicate ποικιλόδειρον, whether the notion be in point of fact true or false. H. Steph. Thes. III. p. 442.: "Ποικιλόδειρος, habens collum varium, i. e. versicolor, maculosum, pictum: ab Hesiodo vero in Erg. ἀνδρῶν ποικιλόδειρος dicitur potius διὰ τὸ ποικιλόφρωνν seu ποικιλόφρον, quod vario modulamine canat: synonymum est αἰολόδειρος." H. Steph. has omitted the word ποικιλόγηρος. It deserves to be noticed that the Codex alter Dorvillianus has in the passage of Hesiod ποικιλόδηρον. Hesych. Δήρη τράχηλος: H. Steph. has the word in the Index to the Thes., but seems to have doubted its existence: "Δήρη Hesychio est μάχη, pugna, certamen, item τράχηλος, in hac tamen posteriore significatione dicitur potius δειρή." Schneider has omitted δήρη i. e. τράχηλος, without reason.

On the 12th Fragment of Archilochus p. 292. Mr. Gaisford contents himself with producing the note of Jacobs:

Καὶ φρονεῦσι τοῖ, ὁκοίοις ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργμασι.

"Auctor Eryxiae in Opp. Platonis p. 397. E. (T. x. p. 255. ed. Bip.): Ἐχει δὲ καὶ τὰλλα πράγματα οὕτω πάντα ὑποῖσι γὰρ ἂν τινες ᾧσιν οἱ χρώμενοι, τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς ἀνάγκη εἶναι καλῶς δ', ἔφη, δοκεῖ μοι καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πεποιθῆσθαι."

Καὶ φρονεῦσι τοῖα, ὁκοίοις ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔρῳμασι.

Ap. Stob., qui h. l. ex Eryxia profert in Flor. Tit. xcii. p. 512, 51. etiam vitiosius legitur: Καὶ φρονεῦσί τοι ᾧκοι οἷς ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργμασι [ἐγκυρέωσιν Platonis Ms. Vat.] ubi tamen vera lectionis vestigia facile agnoscis. Valck. ad Herod. II. p. 141, 98. hæc sic relingenda censet:

Καὶ φρονεῦσι τοῖ ὁκοίως ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργματα,

i. e. καὶ τοῖα εἰσι τὰ ἔργματα, ὁκοίως φρονεῦσι ἐγκυρέωσι. Rerum natura secundum hominum, in quos incidunt, mores mutatur. Paulo durior verborum structura; sed sensus plane is est, quem Æschinus contextus flagitat, et quem desiderabat Clericus in Not. ad Æschin. p. 47."

The passage of Æschines occurs in Dial. II. 16. p. 71, ed. Fisch. 1786: Ἐχει δ', ἔφη, καὶ τὰλλα πράγματα οὕτω πάντα. ὑποῖσι γὰρ ἂν τινες ᾧσιν οἱ χρώμενοι, τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς ἀνάγκη εἶναι καλῶς δ', ἔφη, δοκεῖ μοι καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πεποιθῆσθαι, Καὶ φρονεῦσι τοῖ, ὁκοίοις ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργμασι. The note of FISCHER seems to have escaped the notice both of Mr. JACOBS and of Mr. GAISFORD.

εἷη πετραῖη τε σκιῇ, καὶ βίβλινος οἶνος.—Erg. x. Hm. 587.

"Te om. Gal. βίβλινος L. Holstenius ad Steph. Byz. p. 67, quem secutus est Brunckius et Mss. complures. Vulgatum βέβλινος servat Eustath. II. 1. p. 871, 48. Plus simplici autem incommodo laborat versus. Prorsus enim inusitate et ante se corripitur, et eadem fere sententia recurrit infr. 590. Quare pro

acumine quo lector-medelam, quam potest, excogitet; nam in talibus a Codd. nihil est quod expectemus."

We leave to others, as Mr. G. has done, to settle the point about the metre. But with respect to the reading βιβλινος, we may be permitted to observe that it is a matter of no consequence whatever, whether we read βύβλινος, or βιβλινος, as there can be no doubt that both were used by the Greek writers. In our own opinion far too much attention is paid by the scholars of the present day to the orthography of certain words, which can never be accurately ascertained, because there is good reason to suppose that the Greek writers themselves did not always agree in adopting the same orthography. We are, however, disposed to admit that some of the variations in the orthography of certain words are to be ascribed to the ignorance, or the conceit of transcribers, who introduced into the works of the ancient writers the orthography of their own times. These observations are abundantly confirmed by a passage in Mazochius's Commentary "in Tabulas Heracleenses" p. 200., where the learned editor has collected every thing, which concerns the history of the βύβλινος οἶνος.

Mr. BLOMFIELD on *Æschyl. Prom.* 836. writes thus: "Βιβλίνων Med. M. 1. Colb. 2. Seld. Perpetua in h. v. inter i et u confusio. Eustath. ad Od. φ. p. 1913, 31. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ σημειῶσαι ὅτι ἡ Βύβλος ἐπὶ πόλεως μὲν τῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περιγητῇ (v. 912.) μόνως διὰ τοῦ υ̅ γραφέται· ἐπὶ δὲ φυτοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ μὲν, καὶ μέγιστα παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ὁμοίᾳ ἡ γραφή· οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι τρέφαντες, κατὰ τὸ δύφρον διφρος, μῦσος μῖσος, βίβλος διὰ τοῦ ἰωτά φασι. Brunck. ap. Aristoph. βιβλίον ubique reposuit. In Eurip. Ion. 1195. pro βιβλίνου τε πάματος, legendum βουβλίνου. Βύβλινον οἶνον memorant Theocr. Athen. Eustath. et alii. Cf. Xenoph. Anab. vii. 5, 8. Pausan. Achaic. p. 406. cum Antonin. Lib. c. 30. Parthenium in Erotic. xi. Heinsium ad Ovid. Met. ix. 452. Pierson. ad Mœrin p. 95. Βιβλία, διὰ τοῦ ι, ὡς Πλάτων, Ἀττικῶς· Βυβλία, ὡς Δημοσθένης, κοινῶς."

Mr. B. is, we think, mistaken in supposing that the passage in Euripides needs any correction. From what he adds, after correcting the passage of Euripides, it is plain that he thought that the ancient writers speak only of βύβλινος οἶνος, whereas it has been shown by Mazochius that the word was anciently written βύβλινος, βιβλινος, βίμβλινος. H. Steph. has in the Index to the Thes. acknowledged both βύβλινος, and βιβλινος, and βίμβλινος, but SCHNEIDER has in his Lexicon neglected to insert βίμβλινος.

Ἡ δ' ἄρα Φίξ' ὀλοὴν τέκε, Καδμείοισιν ἔλεθρον.—Theogon. 326.

Mr. G. produces Grævius's excellent note, which is this:—"Reposui veterem lectionem ex antiquorum scholarum auctoritate. qui legat Φίξ' ὀλοήν, et explicat σφίγγα ὀλοήν. Adde, quod Beza dixerat Φίξ, unde φίξιον locus, ubi Sphingis statua legitur. Huic

Euripidis Scholiastes adstipulatur in *Phœnis*, quæ credit *φίχιον* ὄρος a Sphinge dictum esse; ipsamque a Bœotis vocatam *φίχα*. Hinc et Latini *picati* dicti, quorum pedes formam Spingum habebant. Festus: '*Picati* appellantur quidam, quorum pedes formati sunt in speciem Spingum, quod eas Dorii *phicas* vocant.' Sic *φίχεον* τέρας dicitur Sphinx ap. Lycophronem v. 1463. *Φίχιον* vero est mons Bœotiae, cujus meminit in *Ἀσπιδι* v. 33. Stephanus de Urbibus: *Φίχειον* ὄρος Βοιωτίας καὶ διὰ διφθόγγου καὶ διὰ βραχέως τοῦ ι. Vide et Plutarchum in libello, *Quod Bruta ratione utantur*. Mr. Gaisford adds, "*Φίχ'* Trinc. σφίγγ' Ald.," but does not appear to have noticed the passages of Hesychius: *Βίχας* σφίγγας, (where Kuster says, "Bœoti, ni fallor, pro σφίγγας dicebant βίχας, vel φίχας," and where Alberti refers to Ez. Spanh. de P. et U. N. p. 219.): *Φίχα* φίχα, σφίγγα, where Kuster says, "*Φίχα* pro σφίγγα dixerunt Bœoti, vide Grævii Lectt. Hesiod. c. 24. p. 121." *Φικίων* προσθηβών, where Palmerius reads, *Φίχιον* ὄρος πρὸς Θηβών, and Hemsterh. has the following note:—"Æoles *φίχα*, vel *Φίχα* efferunt pro σφίγγα, unde Bœoti adspirata in tenuem conversa βίχας formant, quæ Hesych. suppeditat. Hinc Bœotiae monti nomen accessit *Φίχιον*, vel *Φίχειον*, quem Palmerius Hesychio restitutum voluit in istis, *Φικίων* προσθηβών, valde probabili conjectura: poterat tamen etiam refingi, *Φικτῶν* προσθηβών, vel *προσθίβων*: nam supra legitur, *Σφίχτας* οἱ χίναϊδοι καὶ ἀπαλοὶ: tales autem plerumque *πρώθηβοι*, primo ætatis flore grati: omissum est σ, quod hic a dialecto pendeat, an erranti Hesychio sit tribuendum, non tenere dixero."

Festus, as we have seen, makes the word *phicas* peculiar to the Dorians, whereas the scholiast of Euripides, quoted by Grævius, "tradit *φίχιον* ὄρος a Sphinge dictum esse, ipsamque a Bœotis vocatam *φίχα*." Hemsterhuis differs from both: "Æoles *φίχα*, vel *φίχα* efferunt pro σφίγγα, unde Bœoti adspirata in tenuem conversa βίχας formant, quæ Hesych. suppeditat." Kuster, on the first passage from Hesych., says, "Bœoti, ni fallor, pro σφίγγας dicebant βίχας, vel φίχας," but on the second he writes, "*Φίχα* pro σφίγγα dixerunt Bœoti, vide Grævii Lectt. Hesiod. c. 24. p. 121." Hemsterhuis has produced no authority for his assertion that *φίχα* vel *φίχα* is the Æolic word, whence the Bœotian βίχα descends. There can be little doubt that *φίχα* is the true Bœotian word, because it occurs in the Bœotian poet Hesiod, because it is ascribed to the Bœotians by the Schol. of Euripides, and because *φίχιον*, or *φίχειον* was the name of a mountain in Bœotia. We are not aware that any ancient authority can be adduced for ascertaining the dialects, in which βίχα and φίχα were used for φίχα. Turnebus thus writes in the *Adversaria* III. 10. "*Pica* ap. Festum. Latini *lit. p.* sunt sphinges, unde et ap. eum *picati*, quanquam *cl. p.*, ex se *picatos* propegare possunt, qui Latini

sunt aride illæ volucres fere gryphæ vocatæ, aurum e cavernis penitus egerentes: *pilare* et *compilare* dubium non est, quin a verbo Gr. deducantur Æolico *πιλῆς*, i. e. *fur*, qui *πιλῆς* ab Hesiodo vocatur, sed Æolum est aspirationes in tenuem mutare, ut et in superiore vocabulo, pro *σφιγξ*, Dorice *φιξ*, et Æolice *πῖξ*, unde Lat. *pica* et *picatus*."

H. Stephens has inserted in his *Thesaurus* both *πιξ* and *φιξ*, SCHNEIDER has the second, but omits the first; neither of these lexicographers has noticed *βίγα* for *βίκα*. H. Steph. says well, "ut *φιξ* dicitur pro *σφιγξ*, ita et *φιν* pro *σφιν*, ut tum ap. Homerum, tum ap. Callimachum;" for there can be no doubt that *φιξ* is radically the same word as *σφιγξ*. Bochart (Canaan i. 16.) derives the word *phica* from a Phœnician word, *picchea*, or *phicca*, signifying "sapient, oculatus, auritus," "propter sagacitatem, quia mulier fuit acutissima, quæ per gryphos et ænigmata solertissimorum sui ævi ingenia exercebat." Grammaticus Ms. in Biblioth. Leidensi ap. Valck. ad Ammon. p. 103.: *Τὰ εἰς ἡ μονοσύλλαβα ὀνόματα, ἃν ἔχη τὸ φ, διὰ τοῦ κ κλίνεται, ὡς φριξ, φρικὸς, φιξ, φικὸς· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔχει τὸ φ, διὰ τοῦ χ, ὡς στίξ, στριχὸς, θριξ, τριχὸς· πλὴν τοῦ ἡξ ἰκὸς, ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἐσθίων τὰς ἀμπέλους σκώληξ.*

On the 993d verse of Theognis Mr. G. is silent about the correction of J. D. a Lennep: "*Ἀγαθὰ* speciatim ad *cibos* transfertur cum sæpe alibi, tum in illo Theogn. 993. *Δείπνου δὲ λήγοιμεν, ἔπου τινὰ θυμὸς ἀνώγει, Παντοίων ἀγαθῶν γαστρὶ χαριζόμενοι*, quorum facilis correctio est, cum, quod ap. Athenæum L. vii. p. 310. A. hujus loco legitur *Δ. δ. λήγοι μένος ὃν τινὰ θ. ἀνώγοι Π.* literis aliter in verba distinctis aptam efficiat sententiā, *Δ. δ. λήγοιμεν, ὅσον τινὰ θ. ἀνώγοι Παντοίων, κ.τ.λ.*" Jo. D. a Lennep ad Phalaridis *Epist.* p. 332.

On the 73d verse of Theognis, JACOBS writes thus: "Quod Brunckius, ap. Theogn. v. 73. *Πρῆξιν μὴδὲ φίλοιςιν ὅλως ἀνακρίνεο πᾶσιν*, scripsit *ὁμῶς*, id minime necessarium." Jacobsii Append. in Lucian. ap. Porsoni *Advers.* p. 294.

NOTULÆ QUÆDAM IN PLATONIS MENEXENUM.

Editio, quâ usus sum, studiis Societatis Bipontinæ debetur: ejus paginas, ejus lineas in his adnotationibus, semper adhibui.

[p. 274. l. 1.] *Ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ἡ πόδες Μενέξενος*; S. noster in principio sui Phædri, sicut in Protagoræ initio rogat *ὁ φιλε Φαῖδρε, ποῖ*

ἐν καὶ πόθεν; quam interrogandi formulam imitatur Horat. Sat. iv. 1.
 “Unde et quo Catus?”

[l. 2.] Ἐξ ἀγορᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου. Simili modo hæc verba conjungit Tacit. Agric. ii. “Monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur.” Ex quibus locis patet tam Athenis quam Romæ comitium in foro extitisse.

[l. 8.] συμβουλευεῖν ἄρχειν. Malè, ut mihi quidem videtur, servant editiones: levissimâ mutatione hunc locum sanabis: tu mecum συμβουλεύης reponas, quod postulat rei ratio Græcitatissque analogia.

[l. 11.] ταφὰς μέλλουσι ποιεῖν. Sed in Thucyd. B. λδ. “οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ χρώμενοι, δημοσίᾳ ταφὰς ἐποίησαντο κ. τ. λ.” quæ expressio melior est. Nam plerumque cum voculis τῷ ταφῇ similibus ritusque et cæremonias indicantibus ποιεῖσθαι conjungunt Græci: cum verbis locum et rem denotantibus ποιεῖν adhibetur, ut in sectione antea citatâ “σκηρὴν ποιήσαντες,” “ἐκείνων δὲ διαπρεπῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν κρίναντες, αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐποίησαν.”

[l. 12.] ἀλλὰ τίνα εἶλοντο. sc. οἱ βουλευταί. Quibusdam ex mortuorum consanguineis decerptis funeris publico sumtu celebrati curationem permisit populus. Ili circumstanti spectatorum coronæ sedes et loca, tanquam dispensatores, distribuebant, ritusque cæremoniasque et epulas pro voluptate suâ instituebant. Qui defunctorum virtutes comparatâ oratione verborumque elegantissimè laudaret, a senatu, si Platoni credas, eligebatur: cui tamen repugnare videtur Thucyd. B. λδ ad finem “ἐπειδὰν δὲ κρύψωσι γῇ, ἀνὴρ ἡρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ὅς ἂν γνώμῃ τε δοκῇ μὴ αἰζύνητος εἶναι, καὶ ἀξιώματι προήκη, λέγει ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἐπαίνον τὸν πρέποντα:” quam sententiæ discrepationem, si cuiquam discrepatio esse videatur, Demosthenis ope, facillimè corrigas: audi ipsum oratorum principem, “τὸν πολὺν ρέοντα,” sic in sua de coronâ oratione ἡ πη loquentem: “Χειροτομῶν γὰρ ὁ δῆμος τὸν ἐροῦντ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι, παρ’ αὐτὰ τὰ συμβάντα, οὐ σὲ ἐχειροτόνησε προβληθέντα [sc. ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς] οὐ σὲ καίπερ εὐφωνον ὄντα:” iterumque in sequenti cap. “Καὶ οὐχ ὁ μὲν δῆμος οὕτως, οἱ δὲ τῶν τετελευτηκότων πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τότε αἰρεθέντες ἐπὶ τὰς ταφὰς, ἄλλως πως ἀλλὰ, δέον ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς τὸ περίδεικνον, τοῦτ’ ἐποίησαν παρ’ ἐμοί.” Unde senatum elegisse, populumque oratores approbasse clarissimè liquet.

[p. 275. l. 1.] πολλαχοῦ κινδυνεύει καλὸν εἶναι τὸ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀποθνήσκειν. Recte ad spiritum sed non ad hujusce loci constructionem interpretati sunt editores “Videtur apud plurimas gentes præclarum esse in bello occumbere.” Græco sermوني propiora habebis, si sic construas “apud plurimas gentes parum abest, quin ad honorem famamque ducat mors in bello oppetita.” De verbo κινδυνεύειν Basilii Scholia ἀνέκδοτα in Greg. Nazian. Orat. xxxii. conferas “τὸ δὲ κινδυνεύειν ἐλέγχεσθαι καὶ δείκνυσθαι νῦν σημαίνει· Δημοσθένης κατὰ Μειδίον· ἀλλὰ κινδυνεύει τὸ λίαν εὐτυχὲς ἐνὸς ἐπαυχθεὶς ποιεῖν—Καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθοῦ δὲ εἰληπταί, ὡς Ἐρμογένης ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ· οὐ κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐν δεινότητι· ἐκεῖ γάρ, φησι, κινδυνεύει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι· ἀντὶ τοῦ, προτερὶ μνηστῆ, προκρίνεται. Quæ ex Grammatico MS. de Syntaxi in Bibl. Sangerm. descripta fuisse monet Ruhakenius. Tzetzes Scholiis MSS. in Hermogenem, sic loquitur τὸ κινδυνεύει λέγει μὲν Πλάτωνος

ὑπάρχει· τὸ δὲ ἀναγκαίως ἔχειν σημαίνει ταύτην, ἴδει. Recte Platonica locutionem vocat, quæ tam crebra apud Platonem est, ut singulis paginis reperiat: sed nec ipse, nec alii Grammatici locutionis rationem bene explicuerunt. Optime, ut Ruhnkenio videtur hoc verbum per ἐγγίζει exponit Timæus. Nam, ut Latini dicunt, *periculum est ne hoc ita sit*, pro *parum abest quin ita sit*, sic etiam Græci κινδυνεύειν pro ἐγγίζειν.

[l. 4.] καὶ ἐὰν φαῦλος ᾖ. Interpretes “sive etiam vilis quisplam et ignavus.” Malè meâ quidem sententiâ: non enim ad hominis vitam in facinore consumptam sed ad humilem in civitate conditionem spectat oratio. Sic vocabulo *vile* utitur Shakespearius nostras in Henrico V. Act. iv. Scen. 3. ubi rex comites suos adloquens, dicit, “For he to-day who sheds his blood with me Shall be my brother: be he ne’er so *vile*, This day shall gentle his condition:” Haud tamen ignoro quod huic meæ significationi repugnare videtur Thucyd. B. μβ. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τῶλλα χεῖροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι.

[l. 16.] οἷα δὴ τὰ πολλὰ αἰετ μετ’ ἐμοῦ. Cf. Blomfield Prom. Vincit. 973. Σεβοῦ, προσευχοῦ, θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ’ αἰετ. “Hanc sententiam optimè reddidit Butlerus, “unumquemque regnantem.” Auglicè, “whoever happens to be in power.” “Hæc vis τοῦ ‘Aei cum apud Scriptores Atticos præsertim Oratores frequentissima sit, sæpius tamen minus perspecta, interpretes in errorem duxit.” Thuc. A. ια. οὐκ ἄθροοι, ἀλλὰ μέρει τῷ αἰετ παρατυγχόντι, ἀντεῖχον. Cf. quoque Thuc. B. ια. ἀπὸ θεραπείας τῶν αἰετ πρυστώτων.

[p. 276. l. 5.] οὕτως ἔναυλος ὁ λόγος τε κ. τ. λ. Ruhnkenius in suis super Timæo adnotationibus hæc sequentia ex Lexic. Rhetor. MS. laudat ἔναυλον—ἐνηχον· αὐλὸς γὰρ πᾶν τὸ στενὸν, καὶ ἐπίμηκες· ὁ δὲ πόρος τῶν ὥτων τοιοῦτος. Miltonus in exquisito suo de Paradiso amissâ poemate nobis hominem vivis coloribus depinxit qui τὸν λόγον ἔναυλον ἐν τοῖς ὦσιν habet: qui locus, ut meam de hujusce verbi significatione sententiam optimè exponit, hic laudabitur. Lib. viii. ad init. “The angel ended—and in Adam’s ear So charming left his voice that he awhile Thought him still speaking, still stood fixed to hear.” Cf. Crito ιε. “ταῦτα εὖ ἴσθι ὅτι ἐγὼ δοκῶ ἀκούειν, ὥσπερ οἱ κορυβαντιῶντες τῶν αὐλῶν δοκοῦσιν ἀκούειν” καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ αὕτη ἡ ἡχὴ τούτων τῶν λόγων βομβεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ μὴ δύνασθαι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκούειν.” Rursus Plato de Leg. iii. p. 585. Ἐκ γὰρ τῶν ὑψηλῶν εἰς τὰ πεδία καταβαίνειν, αἶμαι, πᾶσιν φόβος ἔναυλος ἐγεγόνει. Æschin. de Coronâ, §. εχ. ἔναυλον γὰρ ἦν ἐτι τότε πᾶσιν, ὅτι τηνικαῦτα ὁ δῆμος κατελύθη, ubi Palmerius observat metaphoram ab iis sumtam esse quibus post tibiarum sonum aures adhuc personant. Maxim. Tyr. Diss. vii. p. 71. καὶ τὰ ὅσα ἔναυλος ὦν διαμέμνηται τοῦ μέλους καὶ μινυρίζει πρὸς αὐτόν. Ad hujus translate locutionis exemplum, audacter quidem, sed venustè contrarium dixit Synesius de republica p. 32. et de insom. p. 153. εἰ μὴ θυρανήσουσιν οἱ λόγοι περὶ τὰ ὅσα—Hunc nostri locum expressit disertissimus Sophista, qui se totum ad Platonis imitationem comparaverat, Themistius Orat. vi. p. 81. καὶ ταῦτα ἔναυλον εἰς τὰ ὅσα ἐνδοκότερα περιφέρων ἐτι τὸν λόγον.

[l. 8.] 'Εν μακάρων νήσους. Cf. Callistrati Scholion. Φιλταθ' Ἀρμύδα, οὐ τι πῶς γένηται· Νήσους δ' ἐν μακάρων σε φασὶν εἶναι, Ἵναπερ ποδάκης Ἀχάλλεος Τυδείδην τα φασὶν Διομήδεα. Pindar. Olymp. II. 128. 136. μακάρων Νᾶσον ὠκεανίδες Αὔραι περιπνέουσιν· αἱ—θεμα δὲ χρυσὰ φέγγει, Τὰ μὲν χερσόθεν ἀπ' ἀ—γλαῶν δεινδρέων, Ὑδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει, Ὀρμοισι τῶν χέρας ἀνα—πλέκοντι καὶ στεφάνοις.

[l. 11.] 'Ἐξ ὑπογυίου γὰρ παντάπασιν ἡ αἵρεσις γέγονεν. Pro hoc verbo παντάπασιν Tragicī utuntur πᾶσιν. CEd. Col. 1446. Ἀνάξιαί γὰρ πᾶσιν ἐστε δυστυχεῖν, et CEd. Rex. 40. ὦ κρᾶτιστον πᾶσιν Οἰδίπε κάρα.

[p. 277. l. 3.] Οὐκ οἶε, ὦ Σώκρατες. i. e. οἶε ὥς εἶναι μέτα. Similis τοῦ οὐκ usus in Xenophontis Anabasi A. iii. ad iuit. invenitur. οἱ γὰρ στρατιῶται οὐκ ἔφασαν ἵναί τοι πρόσω i. e. ἔφασαν οὐκ ἵναί τοι εἰς τὴν μέρος τοῦ χωρίου ὄντως πρόσω, quod minus perspexerunt editores; "tu mecum construas ulterius se porrecturos negabant." Similiter οὐκ ἔφη non idem quod Latine "non verbum addidit," sed "se hoc vel illud faciendum esse negabat" sonat; sed de his nequid nimis.

[l. 4.] Οὐ μέντοι, μὰ Δία. μὰ Δία negantis, νῆ Δία plerumque affirmantis est. cf. Aristoph. Plut. 100. ubi Pluto dicenti Ἀφετόν με νῦν ἴσταν γὰρ ἴδῃ τᾶπ' ἐμοῦ respondet ille senex Chremylus μὰ Δί, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐξόμεσθα σοῦ, i. e. οὐκ ἀφισόμεθα, et in eadem fabella v. 128. Χρεμ—Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀποδείξω σε τοῦ Διὸς πολὺ Μεῖζον δυνάμενον ΠΑ.... ἐμὲ σύ... ΧΡ. νῆ τὸν οὐρανόν. i. e. "Me hoc esse facturum per cælum juro." Sed huic Grammaticorum regulæ adversatur hujusdem comædiæ v. 74. quem videas.

[l. 8.] Ἄλλ' ἥπερ πολλοὺς—περικλέα τὸν Ξάνθιππον. Hæc ad eam Aspasiā spectant, quæ veteri illustrique Mileti civitate orta patrem habuit Axiochum tamque eximie fuit pulcritudinis ut de eâ dicere solerent amatores, "Induitur, formosa est; exiit, ipsa forma est"—Hæc tamen oris suavitas ingenii magnitudine adeo superabatur ut minus corporis quam mentis dotibus amantium animos sibi devincere videretur: Socratem enim, virum multiplicem virtutibus, gnavum, agilem, providumque, et rigidæ sæctatorem virtutis inter amicos sodalesque numeravit: et Periclem hominum ætatis suæ facile principem, et civilium militariumque officiorum patientem ac peritum pariter, tanto amore adurebat, ut, quicquid ei liberet, id ille pro fido vindicaret, et pro virili faceret. Hinc bellum inter Samios Atheniensesque suos conflassis narrabatur, vehementi Aspasiæ amore percussus ejusque illecebris delinitus: quam suspicionem augebat constans rumor eundem, ubi otio locum fecissent negotia, sæminæ familiaritatis assidue abusus: hinc derivabatur acerrima comicorum poetarum derisio, "inque rugas mille redibant" Aspasiæ Periclisque nomine: unum e multis, quæ nostri loco attinent, exemplis lectori sufficiat. Aristoph. Ach. 524. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ σμικρὰ καπνιχόρια· πόρνην δὲ Συναίθαν ἰόντα Μεγάραδε Νεανίαί κλέπτονσι μεθύσκοῦντα· καὶ οἱ Μεγάροις οὐδὲν ἀντιγυμνοί· Ἀντιέκλεψαν Ἀσπασίας πόρνα δύο· κἀντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ πολλῶν καπνιχῶν· Ἑλλᾶσι πᾶσιν ἐκ τριῶν λαικαστῶν. Ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ Περικλέης οὐλομένης Ἠοτραπ', ἐβρόντα, ζυγεῖσκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Qui plura velit, is Periclis vitam, a Plutarcho conscriptam, adeat.

[L. 11.] ὁ μὲν μουσικῆς. In hoc loco verbum verbo reddere curaverunt nostri verè fidi interpretes “*Continus quidem musicæ male quidem, si per musicam “modulorum concinnorum sententiam, et non “intentionem, remissionem, flexum et modulationem vocis intelligas: omnia quæ in orando maxime pertinent ad movendos audientium affectus. Huic vocis modulandæ studio si discere velimus quam pertinaciter se impenderent antiquiores, uno contenti sumus exemplo Caii Gracchi, præcipui suorum temporum oratoris, cui empcionanti consistens post eum musicus fistulâ, quam τὸν ἄριον vocant, modos, quibus debet intendi, ministrabat: de qua re adeat, qui velit Ciceron. de Orat. iii. 60, 61. Gellium i. 11. Valer. Maxim. viii. 10. Quintilian de Inst. Orat. i. 10. Plutarchum in Graccho H. Stæph. p. 1513.*

Quoniam verò de verbo μουσικῆ agitur locusque adest opportunus, occasione paulo fusius de hac voculâ disserendi libenter arripiam. Budæus post prolixas ex Platone et Aristotele de μουσικῆ et μουσικῆ citationes, summam antedictorum colligens affirmat, “*musicæ appellationem apud priscos humanitatem literarum significasse, in quâ ingenuos homines docebant otium contere animumque recreare: recentiores verò ad numerorum modulationem hoc vocabulum trans tulisse, quia musica, velut ludus, animi a curâ vexati est requies.*” Huic docto viro doctiorem Quintilianî sententiam opponamus, qui in libro primo de Institutione suâ Oratoriâ cap. 10. sic loquitur. “*Nam quis ignorat musicen tantum jam illis ANTIQVIS temporib non studii modo, verum etiam venerationis habuisse, ut iidem Muses et vates et sapientes judicarentur?*” Scilicet illud Romanæ togæ decus et ornamentum Pindaricam τὸν σοφὸς significationem in mentem suam vocabat, quippe Pindarus poetas semper τοὺς σοφούς denominat, quod liquet, ut unum e multis locum excerpam, ex Olymp. 1. 13. “*Ὁ δὲ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται Σοφῶν μητρίσσι κ. τ. λ.*” Sic etiam Aristophanes Vespæ 1243. “*μετὰ τοῦτον Αἰσχίνης ὁ Σέλλου δέξεται Ἀνὴρ σοφὸς καὶ μουσικὸς, κἄτ’ ἕσσεται κ. τ. λ.*” Et Timagenes auctor est omnium in literis studiorum antiquissimam Musicen extitisse, et testimonio sunt clarissimi poætæ, apud quos inter regalia convivîa laudes heroum ac Deorum ad citharam caneantur. Atque claros nomine sapientiæ viros nemo dubitaverit studiosos Musices fuisse, quum Pythagoras atque eum secuti, acceptam sine dubio antiquitatis opinionem, vulgaverint, mundum ipsum ejus ratione esse compositum. Plato in Timæo ne intelligi quidem nisi ab iis, qui hanc quoque partem disciplinæ diligenter perceperint, potest. Archytas atque Aristoxenus etiam subjectam grammatice musicæ putaverunt, tum Eupolis, apud quem Prodamus et musicen et literas docet. Et Maricas, qui est Hyperbolus, nihil se ex musicis scire nisi literas confitetur. Aristophanes quoque non uno libro sic institui pueros antiquitus solito esse demonstrat: et apud Menandrum in Hypobolimeo senex repositi filium patri rationem impendiorum quæ in educationem contulerat, opponens psaltis se et geometris, multa dicit dedisse: unde etiam ille mos, ut in convivîis post cenam circumferretur lyra: cujus quum se imperitum Themistocles confessus esset, ut verbis Ciceronis

utar, habitus est indoctior. Ex quibus locis immane quantum discrepent Quinctiliani Budæique sententiæ facillimè apparet. *Hic enim, παρά τῇ μουσικῇ* harmoniæ numeros modosque significante, aliam liberalium artium significationem deducit: *ille autem "doctrinam"* primum esse sensum, unde postea derivatur secundus. Horum utri credamus, Quirites? His sequentibus benè perpensis, iudicet exquisitissimus lector. Athenæus in libro suo xv. hæc habet, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαῖον ἢ μουσικὴ ἐπ' ἀνδρείον προτροπὴ ἦν. Xenophon in Rep. Lacedæmonica de pueris et adolescentibus Spartanis εὐθὺς δὲ πέμπουσιν εἰς διδασκάλων, μαθησομένους καὶ γράμματα, καὶ μουσικὴν, καὶ τὰ ἐν Παλαιστρᾷ, sicut Arist. Polit. vii. dicit quatuor præcipue esse quæ discere solent juniores γράμματα καὶ γυμναστικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν καὶ ἐνίοις τὴν γραφικὴν—omnia quæ exempla ab Henrico Stephano ut Budæi sententiam corroborarent adducta per "scientiam doctrinamque" explicat ille Lexicographorum summus: sed, ni fallor, in contrarium rei quam probare conatur, tendunt. Duces enim maximos et fidibus et tibiis præmisisse traditum, quod ex Theocriti Ἡρακλίσκῳ v. 103. accipimus Γράμματα μὲν τὸν παῖδα [sc. Ἡρακλῆα] γέρον Λίνος ἐξεδίδασκεν Τόξον δ' ἐκτανύσαι καὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι διατῶν Ἑβρύτος, ἐκ πατέρων μεγάλαις ἀφρονέως ἀρούραις. Αὐτὰρ ἰοιδὸν ἔθηκε καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρας ἐπλασσε Πνέιντα ἐν φόρμυγι Φιλαμμονίδας Εὐμόλπος—atque ex Cornelio Nepote, "Eruditus sic erat Epaminondas ut nemo Thebanus magis: nam et citharizare et cantare ad chordarum sonum doctus est a Dionysio, qui non minore fuit in musicis gloriâ quam Damon aut Lamprus, quorum pervulgata sunt nomina cantare carmina tibiis ab Olympiodoro, saltare a Calliphronē: at philosophiæ præceptorem habuit Lysim Tarentinum Pythagoræum." Adde quod Lycurgus durissimarum Lacedæmonii legum auctor, musices disciplinam probavit, exercitusque Spartanos musicis accensit modis ὥστε μουσικὴν ἐπ' ἀνδρείον εἶναι προτροπὴν. Præterea meam locorum antedictorum constructionem defendit Arist. Plut. 1160. Πλούτῳ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο συμφερώτατον Ποιεῖν ἄγωνας μουσικοὺς καὶ γυμνικοὺς. Ranae 727. Τῶν πολιτῶν θ' οὐδὲ μὲν ἴσμεν εὐγενεῖς καὶ σώφρονας Ἄνδρας ὄντας καὶ δικαίους καὶ καλοὺς τε καὶ αγαθοὺς Καὶ τραφέντας ἐν παλαιστροῖς καὶ χοραῖς καὶ μουσικῇ Προσεχόμεν—ubi ex Blomfieldi monitu veterem lectionem rejicimus. ibid. 797. καὶ γὰρ ταλάντῳ μουσικὴ σταθμῆσεται. Pind. Olymp. i. 22. Ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ Μουσικαῖς ἐν αὐτῷ. Pauca sunt, si ulla, quæ Budæi sententiam patrocinantur, loca ex antiquioribus scriptoribus desumpta: ubi μουσικὴ pro omni institutione liberali, quam ἐγκύκλιαν παιδείαν vocant, sumitur, auctor post Thucydidis tempora vixit. Hæc Budæi citationibus adjicias. Plato civili viro quem πολιτικὸν vocant, necessariam musicen credidit. In Equitibus v. 188. hic oritur sermo inter Agarocritum et Demum. Ἀγ. Ἀλλ' ὃ γὰρ, οὐδὲ μουσικὴν ἐπίσταμαι Πλὴν γραμμάτων, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι κακὰ κακῶς. ΔΗ. Τοῦτί σε μόνον ἐβλαψεν, ὅτι καὶ κακὰ κακῶς Ἡ δὲ μαγωγία γὰρ οὐ πρὸς μουσικόν ἔσ' ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, οὐδὲ χρηστοῦ τοὺς τρόπους. Ranae 171. Ἰθὺν νυν λιβανωτὸν δεῦρό τίς καὶ πῦρ δότω, Ὅπως ἂν εὖζῶμαι πρὸ τῶν σοφισμάτων Ἀγῶνα φέμαι τίνδε μουσικώταται. In Platoni lib. ii. de Leg. Ἔστι δὲ πῶς παιδεία, ἢ μὲν ἐπὶ σώματι, γυμναστικὴ, ἐπὶ δὲ Ψυχῇ, μουσικὴ: ubi mox sequitur

μουσικὴν δὲ εἶπεν, τίθης λόγους ἢ οὐ; "Εγὼ γε inquit alter. Isocrates μουσικὴν πόλιν facit urbem literarum amantissimam in Epistola ad præfectos Mytlenæos. Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τὴν μὲν πόλιν γυμνὴν τὸ πνεῦμα ὁμολογεῖσθαι μουσικωτάτην εἶναι, τὴν δὲ προύχοντα τῶν τῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ πόλιν ἰσχυρίαν τῆς παιδείας ταύτης φεύγειν ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης πόλεως. Notum est illud in Eunuchis, "periculum fac in musicis:" nimirum ab ipso Cicerone Tusc. v. 23. Musæ pro doctrinâ et humanitate ponuntur.

[p. 278. 7.] Περιλείμματ' ἄττα ἐξ ἐκείνου συγκολλήσας. Omnes Athenarum laudes quas in funebri suâ oratione omisit Pericles, hæc Platonis oratio complectitur. Multa de populo, multa et ea de reipublicæ πολιτεία præclara dixerunt priores, nihil de historia rebusque Atticis disserentes. Hoc igitur campo quoniam magis in aperto cunctisque adhuc fuisset intactus, primus omnium decurrere Lysias decrevit, tam verbis quam sententiis gravis orator: quem Plato, quia immensum ingeniis aperiebatur opus, passibus minime imperiis sectatus, hanc e filis a Pericle relictis deductam orationem, tanquam *Aspasiario* sermoni supplementum, composuit.

[l. 11.] 'Αλλ' ὅπως μὴ μοι χαλεπανεῖ ἡ διδάσκαλος—subauditur δέδοικα aut quid simile. cf. Æschyl. Prom. Vinc. 68. ὅπως μὴ σαρτὸν οἰκτιρεῖς ποτε, ubi ὁρατεῖον aut βλέπτεον supplendum est. Plene dixit Thucyd. B. 57. ὁράτε, ὅπως μὴ οὐκ ἀποδέξωνται ubi ex Dawesiano canone ἀποδέχονται reponas. Accipe etiam quæ vir hujus sæculi, dum vixit, doctissimus de his verbis ad Hecuham V. 398. habet. "Plerumque quidem ὅπως vel ὅπως μὴ cum secundâ personâ, aliquando cum tertiâ construitur. Aristoph. Eccles. 296. "Ὅπως δὲ τὸ σύμβολον λαβόντες ἔπειτα πλη—σίοι καθεδούμεθα. Plene dixit post paullo "Ὅρα δ' ὅπως ὠθήσομαι τοῦσδε τοὺς ἐξ ἡστέος."

[l. 18.] Εἰ με κελεύεις ἀποδύντα ὀρχησάσθαι, χαρισαίμην ἂν. Hæc habes loquentem Cicronem in oratione, quam habuit pro Murena. Saltatorem appellat L. Murænam Cato. "Si vere objicitur saltatio, maledictum est vehementis accusatoris; sin falsè, maledici conviciatoris. Quare cum istâ sis auctoritate, Marce Cato, non debes temerè consulem populi Romani saltatorem vocare, sed conspiciere quibus præterea vitii affectum esse necesse sit eum, cui vere istud obijci possit. Nemo enim ferè saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit, neque in solitudine, neque in convivio moderato atque honesto." Apud Romanos ita inhonesta saltatio putabatur, ut Domitianus quæstorium virum, quod gesticulandi saltandique studio teneretur, movit Senatu. Sennepioniam reprehendit Sallustius non quod saltare, sed quod optimè saltare sciret. "Erat," inquit, "docta psallere et saltare elegantius quam necesse est probæ." Luculentam sanè de saltatione historiam narrat Herodotus in Erato Sect. 139. qua Hippocleides Agaristam Clithenis filiam et hæredem unicam per gesticulationes suas amittit. Κλεισθένης γὰρ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ὀρχησόμενον ἀποστυγέων γαμβρῶν διὰ οἱ ἔτι γενέσθαι Ἰπποκλείδεα διὰ τὴν τε ὀρχησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναίδειαν, κατεῖχον ἐκωτὸν, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκτραγῆναι ἐς αὐτόν· ὥς δὲ εἶδε τοιοῦτα ἐκείνῳ χειροποιήματα, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος, εἶπε, "Ὁ καὶ Τισαφρόν ἀπυρχήσας γε μὴν εἰν γάμον;" ὃ δὲ Ἰπποκλείδης ὑπολαβὼν εἶπε "Ὁ φραττὶς, Ἰπποκλείδη." Sed ne tam turpem apud Græcos quam

apud Romanos saltationem putaveris, scias "in Epaminondæ virtutibus commemorari saltasse eum commode, scienter tibiis cantasse," rem quam voluptate quidam incredibili narrat Nepos.

[p. 279. 1.] Ἔργῳ μὲν ἡμῖν οἶδε κ.τ.λ. cf. nobilissimam de hoc loco Longini sententiam in inmortali περὶ Ὑψους. §. κη tractatu. Ἡ περίφρασις πολλὰκις συμψέγγεται τῇ κυριολογίᾳ καὶ εἰς κόσμον ἐπιπολὺ σαφέστερα καὶ μάλιστα ἂν μὴ ἔχη φυσῶδες τι καὶ ἄμουνσον, ἀλλ' ἡδέως κεκραμένη. Ἰκανὸς δὲ τοῦτο τεκμηριῶσαι καὶ Πλάτων κατὰ τὴν εἰσβολὴν τοῦ Ἐπιταφίου "Ἐργῳ μὲν ἡμῖν οἶδ' ἔχουσι τὰ προσήκοντα σφίσι αὐτοῖς, ὧν τυχόντες, πορεύονται τὴν εἰμαρμένην πορείαν προπεμφθέντες κοινῇ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων." Οὐκοῦν τὸν θάνατον εἶπεν "εἰμαρμένην πορείαν," τὸ δὲ τετυχηκέναι τῶν νομιζομένων "προπεμψήν τινα δημοσίην ὑπὸ πατρίδος." Ἀρα δὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς μετρίως ὥγκωσε τὴν νόησιν; ἢ ψιλὴν λαβὼν τὴν λέξιν, ἐμελοποίησε, καθάπερ ἁρμονίαν καὶ τῇ ἐκ τῆς περιφράσεως περιχεόμενος εὐμέλειαν.

[ibid.] Ἡμῖν οἶδ' ἔχουσι i. e. παρ' ἡμῖν apud nos. Frequens est talis hujus prepositionis ellipsis. Homeri. Il. Δ. 95. πᾶσι δέ κε Τρώεσσι πόρην καὶ κύδος ἄρου. Il. O. 87. Θέμιστι δὲ καλλιπαρῆς Δέκτρο δέπας. H. X. 119. Τρῶσι δ' αὖ μετόπισθε γερούσιον ὕρην ἔλωμαι. Hec. 309. ἡμῖν δ' Ἀχιλλεύς ἀξίος τιμῆς: quæ ibi annotavit Porsonus collatu digna sunt. Alcest. 446. ὦ Πελίον θύγατερ, Χαίρονσά μοι εἰν Ἀΐδα δόμοισι, Τὸν ἀνάλιον οἶκον οἰκετεύοις, ubi sententiæ summa, pro Græcorum more, non a verbo sed a participio exprimitur, et etiam quæ Tatius protulit, in Museo Critico p. 534. cujus ignarus hæc scripsi.

[ibid.] Προπεμφθέντες. Hæc vacula de funebri pompâ sæpe usurpatur. Soph. CEd. Col. 1667. Ποῦ δ' αἶ τε παῖδες χ' οἱ προπέμψαντες φίλων; Æschyl. Sept. cont. Theb. 1062. προπέμπειν ἐπὶ τὸν τύμβον. Ochoeph. 20. Ἰατρὸς ἐκ δόμων ἐβην Χοᾶς προτομῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς σὺν κτύφῳ. Sept. Theb. 1071. Ἡμεῖς μὲν ἔμεν καὶ ζυνθάψομεν Αἶδε προτομῆς. Hæc prosecutrices, dum funus ad sepulcrum procedebat, pæniæ cavebant, ut ex Eur. Alcest. 624, 5. Ὑμεῖς δὲ τὴν θανοῦσαν, ὡς νομίζεται, Προτομῆς ἐξισύσαν ὑστάτην δδὸν, accipimus.

[l. 11.] Τοῖσι ζῶσιν εὐμενῶς παραινέσεται. Isocrates ad Demonium οὐ παράκλησιν εὐρόντες ἀλλὰ παραινέσειν γράψαντες, "ex quo loco," inquit Augerus, "apparet per παράλησιν intelligi debere hortationem ad eloquentiam, et per παραινέσειν hortationem ad virtutem, unde hæc oratio inscribitur πρὸς Δημόνικον παραινέσειν, vel παραινέτικὸς λόγος." Quid vult per παραινέσειν in subsequenti loco explicat ipse Isocrates: Συμβουλευεῖν ὧν χρὴ τοὺς νεωτέρους ὑρέεσθαι καὶ τίνων ἔργων ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ ποίους τισὶν ἀνθρώποις ὁμιλεῖν καὶ πῶς τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον οἰκονομεῖν.

[p. 280. 1. 2.] Ἀγαθοὶ δὲ ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸ φῦναι ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. Hor. Car. iv. 4. 25. Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis: Est in juvenia, est in equis patrum Virtus, nec imbellem feroces Progenerant equis columbas. "Respicit," ut verbis Valckenaeri utar, "in his nostris questionem istac ætate jam agitatam in Scholis Sophistarum, περὶ ἀρετῆς, εἰ δὲ δακτόν" quam tractarunt in Menone Plato, Æschines Socr., Diak. I. Plutarchus scripto libello docuit ὅτι δακτόν ἡ ἀρετὴ. Egregie Quinctiliun. Instit. Orat. lib. c. 2. init. 'Virtus etiamsi quosdam impetus ex naturâ sumit, tamen perficienda doctrina est:' paucis dixerat

idem Pindarum secutus Hor. Carm. iv. 4. 88. "Doctrina sed non pro-
mōvet insitam. Euripides palmam dat ταντοῖσιν Ὀρεῖς διδάκταιν μηδὲν,
ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληγεν εἰς τὰ πάντα ῥῆμας." Cum hi
locis Montanus ad Hippolyti sui v. 77. egregiè, ut solet, confert
Bacchus 314. Ὅχι δ Διόνυσος ὡς φρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει Γυναικας εἰς ἀρετὴν
Κύπριον, ἀλλ' εἰ τῇ φύσει τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἐνεσθαι εἰς τὰ πάντα καὶ Τριταῖον
σκοπεῖν χρῆ: quibus locis a viro doctissimo allatis hæc addas, ἡ φύσις
τὸ εὐφές prædicat Euripides Orest. 126. Ὡς φύσις, ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀρετὴν
μέγ' εἰ κακόν, Σωτήριόν τε τοῖς καλῶς κειτημένοις. Iph. Aul. 561. τῶν καλῶν
θ' αἱ παιδεύόμεναι Μεγά φέρουσιν εἰς ἀρετὴν. Similiter Pindar. Olymp.
ii. 154—9. Σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶ· μαθόντες δέ, λάβροι Παγγλωσσῶν,
κόρακες ὡς, Ἀκραντα γαρύμεν, Διὶς πρὸς ὄρνεχα θεῖον. Olymp. ix. 52.
τὸ δὲ φυᾶ κρείσσον ἄπαν. Nem. iii. 69. συγγενεὶ δέ τις εὐδοξία μέγα
βρίθει Ὅς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, λεφηνὸς ἀνὴρ.

[I. 3.] Τὴν εὐγένειαν οὖν πρῶτον αὐτῶν ἐγκωμιάζωμεν. Recte interpretes "generosam stirpem laudemus"—ex præmissis εὐγένεια significasse generosam indolem quondam putavi, inmemor hujus Aristot. Rhet. H. et ad medium: ἡ δὲ εὐγένεια ἐντιμότης τις προγενέσθαι ἐστὶ.... Ἔστι δὲ εὐγενὲς μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ γένους ἀρετὴν γεννῆσαι δὲ, κατὰ τὸ μὴ ἐξίστασθαι ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ὑπὲρ ὡς ἐπιπλεῖν οὐ συμβαίνει τοῖς εὐγενέσι.

[L. 7.] Οὐδὲ τοὺς ἡγόνους τοιούτους ἀποφηναμένη μετοικούντας ἐν τῇ χωρᾷ. Notum est etiam tironibus quanto fastu τοὺς μετοίκους θεωροῦσιν veteres Attici. Aristoph. Ach. 503. Αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐσμέν οὐκ Ἀθηναῖοι τ' ἄγων, Κοῦπῳ ξένοι πάρεσιν· οὔτε γὰρ φόροι ἔχουσιν, οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν οἱ ἔξμματοι. Ἀλλ' ἐσμέν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι. Τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχιστα τῶν ἀσθῶν λέγειν. Hujus inanis superbia causam tradit Thucydidēs A. β. τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλείστον διὰ τὸ λεπτόγεων ἀστασίαστον οὔσαν, ἀνθρωποὶ ὥκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ. Pericles etiam in funebri suā oratione ad init. “τὴν γὰρ χώραν ἀεὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ οἰκοῦντες, διαδοχῇ τῶν ἐπιγίγνομένων μέχρι τοῦδε ἐλευθέρην δι' ἀρετὴν παρέδοσαν.” In hac laude jungitur M. Cicero pro Flacco loquens: “Quæ [sc. Attica] vetustate ea est ut ipse ex sese suos cives genuisse dicatur, et eorum velum terra parens, alitrix, patrin, dicatur.” Hæc sententia, quæ Athenienses Atticæ indigetis declarat, in Homeri temporibus etiam valebat, qui in navium populorumque catalogo hos habet versus, Il. B. 545. Οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον, εὐκτίμενον πολίεστρον, Δημόν Ἐρεχθίδος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη Θρέψε, Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τότε δὲ Ζεῦδος ἄρουρα κ. τ. λ. Demosthenes in suā περὶ παραπρεσβείας oratione sic cives suos adloquitur: “μόνοι γὰρ ἀπάντων ὑμεῖς ἀνθρώπους καὶ Ἀρκάδας,” qui etiam προσέληνοι vocabantur. Talibus orationum historicorum sermonibus delinuit, indignabantur Athenienses, si quis ἀντροχθονίαν suam verbis vel levissimis perstringeret: testis est infelix ille comicus poeta, quem maximā severitate mulctabant, quia, de patriæ suæ origine et cæremoniis ex Ægypto allatis disserens, hæc nominata adiciebat: Αἰγυπτὸν τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν πεποιήκασιν ἀντ' Ἀθηνῶν. Divo Paulo, ἐποίησεν ἐξ ἐνὸς αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν τῶν γῆς, loquente, Cecropίδα τιμ' οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον. Mos etiam fuit Atheniensium, antequam respublica eorum a Solone corri-

geretur, capillos in conii speciem formare et colligere in vertice: quam crinium metam *τεττίγων ἐντέρει* comprehendebant, ut se *αὐτόχθονας* hoc argumento indicarent; cuius rei in Ciridis poemate meminit Virgilius: "Ergo omnis caro residebat cura capillo, Aurea solenni comitum quem fibula ritu Cecropiæ tereti nectebat dente cicadæ:" neque aliter Thucydides A. στ. *Χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐν ἔρει κρωβύλον ἀνέσταντο τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν.*

[l. 10.] *Καὶ τρεφομένους οὐχ ὑπὸ μηρυιάς.* Metaphora ab inimicitia quam erga privignos suos habuisse narrantur apud veteres novercæ; in multis locis *μηρυιά* idem quod "exitium" vel "exitialis" sonat. Eustath. ad II. E. p. 560. 19. *μηρυιά*—ἦτοι ἐχθρὰ καὶ ὀλέθριος. Hesiod. "Ἄλλοτε *μηρυιά* πέλοι ἡμέρα, ἄλλοτε μήτηρ. Æschyl. Prom. Vinct. 752. *Σαλμυδυσία γνάθος Ἐχθροῦ γενος ναύταισι, μηρυιά νῶν.* Antholog. Lib. I. 50. *Μηρυιαὶ προγόνοισιν αἰεὶ κάκον· οὐδὲ φιλοῦσαι Σώζουσιν·* *ὅσοι γὰρ γνῶθι καὶ Ἰππόλυτον.* Eur. fragment. "Ὡς οὐδὲν ὕψος φασὶ *μηρυιάς* φρονεῖν Νόθοισι παῖσιν, ὧν φυλάσσομαι πόγον. Sic etiam Latini de novercali studio putaverunt. Virgilius Georg. II. 126. "Media facti tristes succos tardumque soporem Felicis mali, quo non præsentium ullum, Pocula si quando *σενᾶ* infecere novercæ, Miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia pocla, Auxilium venit et membris agit atra venenum." Ecl. III. 33. "Est mihi namque domi pater, est *injusta noverca*." Hor. Epod. V. 9. "Quid, ut noverca, me intueris, aut uti Petita ferro bellua." Ovid Metam. I. 147. "Lurida terribiles miscent aconita novercæ." Juv. in Sat. vi. 627. sic de fœminis loquitur: "Qderunt natos de pellice; nemo recuset, Nemo velat, jamjam privignum occidere fas est."—Tac. Annal. i. 10. "Postremò Livia gravis in rempublicam mater, gravior domui Cæsarum *noverca*." Idem ferme usus est vocis "patruus." Hor. Sat. II. iii. 88. "Ne sis patruus mihi" i. e. "ne sis severus." In alio loco "Iratum patrum, vicinos, te tibi iniquum." Carm. III. xii. 3. "Exanimari metuentes patruæ verbera linguae."

[l. 12.] *Καὶ νῦν κείσθαι τελευτήσαντες ἐν οἰκείοις τόποις τῆς τεκούσης.* Magnum apud veteres malum putabatur si quispiam in exterâ regione moreretur, quod colligas ex sequente anonymi cujusdam epigrammate, *Eis αἰδὼν ἰθεῖα κατήλυσαι, εἴτ' ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν Στείχεις, εἴτε νέκυσ κείσθαι ἐξ Μερῶς. Μὴ σέ γ' ἀνιάτω πάτρης ἀποτῆλε θανόντα. Πάντοθεν εἰς ὃ φέρων εἰς Ἀθῆναι ἀνεμος.* His epigramma a Demosthene in τῇ περὶ στεφάνου oratione citatum addas, ubi super hæc mortuis gratulatur, quod Γαῖα—*πατρὶς ἔχει κόλποις τῶν πλεῖστα καμόντων Σώματα.*

[l. 13.] *Ὑποδεξαμένης* male reddiderunt interpretes "quæ excepit." Non, si quid ego recti video, sed "quæ aluit."

[p. 281. l. 4.] *Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ χρόνῳ ἐν ᾧ ἡ πᾶσα γῆ ἀνεδίδου καὶ ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα παντοδαπά.* Hic latet menda, nulli editorum adhuc observata: *ἐν* in sensu transitivo planè solæcum est: tu mecum reponas *ἐν*, quamvis ne sic quidem, ut mihi videtur, rectus esset textus—*Quid si ἀνεδίδου* primariam esse lectionem, pro qua καὶ *ἐν* fuit glossa, dicamus? quæ glossa, librariorum oscitantia, postea in textum irrepsit—Quoad sententiam, terram olim efferata animalia edidisse docet Æschylus in Suppl. 261. "Ἄπυ γὰρ ἔλθων ἐκ πέρας Ναρνακτίας

ἰατρόμαντις καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, χθόνα Τήνδ' ἐκκαθαίρει ἐκβάλλων βροτοφθόρων. Τὰ δὴ παλαιῶν αἱμάτων μύσματος Χρυσόθεος ἔθηκε γὰρ μηνιτὴ δάκη Δράκοντ' ὄμιλον, δυσμενὴ ζυνοικίαν. Μηνιτὴ δάκη cetera, *berrima Porsoni emendatio est pro μηνὴ καὶ δάκη.*

[I. 7.] Ἐξελέξατο δὲ τῶν ζώων καὶ ἐγέννησεν ἄνθρωπον, ὃ οὐκ οἶσται, κ. τ. λ. Cf. Longinum §. 35. Ἡ φύσις οὐ ταπεινὸν ἡμᾶς ἔχον, οὐδ' ἀγεννὲς ἔκρινε τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Eurip. Med. Πάντων δ' ὅς ἐστι κακὸν καὶ γνωμὴν ἔχει Γυναῖκες ἐσμέν ἀθλιώτατον φυτὸν. Theoc. Idyll. 37. Κρᾶναι καὶ βοτάναι, γλυκερὸν φυτὸν. cf. Ovid. Metam. 2. 210. Quid meruere boves, animal sine fraude dolisque. Juven. Sat. 1. 140. Quanta est gula quæ sibi totos Ponit apros, animal propter convivia natum.

[I. 8.] Καὶ δίκην καὶ θεοὺς μόνον νομίζει. cf. Xenophon. Memorab. lib. i. ad initium. Ὡς οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν Σωκράτης, οὐδ' ἡ πόλις νομίζει, θεοὶ. Med. 493. Θεοὺς νομίζεις τοὺς τότε οὐκ ἄρχειν ἔτι; cf. quoque Hesiodum, 799, 800. Ἄλλ' οἱ θεοὶ σθένουσι χῶ κείνων κρατῶν Νόμος. γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγοῦμεθα.

[I. 12.] Ὡ καὶ γυνὴ δὴλῃ τεκοῦσά τε ἀληθῶς, καὶ μὴ, ἀλλ' ὑποβάλλομένη. Latine, Quo planè discernitur mulier illa quæ peperit, ab illa quæ infantem supposuit. Talis τοῦ ὑποβάλλεσθαι sensus haud est infrequens, et crimen, quod ea vocula denotat, nil nisi sæculum putabatur, quod ex sequentibus locis colligas. Thesm. 339. mala ei devolvuntur ὅστις ἐπιβουλεύει. Ἡ τὸν τύραννον ζυγκατάγειν, ἡ παιδίον ὑποβάλλομένην κατεῖπέ τις. Ibid. 407. Ἐλεν' γυνὴ τις ὑποβάλλεσθαι βούλεται, Ἀποροῦσα παιδῶν; οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἔστιν λαθεῖν. Luculentam sane de hoc crimine ab ejusdem fabulæ 505. historiam habebis, quem videas. Phœn. 30. Ἡ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόνον Μαστοῖς ὑφείρο, quæ res est prorsus alia.

[I. 15.] Μῆνι γὰρ—ἤνεγκε τὸν τῶν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν καρπὸν. Lucet. lib. vi. 1. "Primæ frugiferos fetus mortalibus ægris Dididerunt quondam præclaro nomine Athenæ: Et recreaverunt vitam legesque rogarunt."

[p. 282. l. 3.] Τοῦτου τοῦ καρποῦ οὐκ ἐφθόνησεν. Hujus Syntaxeos pauca invenies exempla. Prom. Vinc. 603—4. μηδὲ μοι φθονήσῃς εὐγμάτων, ἀναξ. Hercul. Furens. 333. κοσμεῖθ' ἔσω μολόντες' οὐ φθονῶ πεπλῶν. Hunc Græcismum imitatur Horat. Sat. 1. vi. 83, 84. neque illi *Sepositi ciceris* nec longæ invidit avenæ. Interdum etiam accusativum post se adsciscit (Edip. Tyr. 310. σὺ δ' οὖν φθονήσας μήτ' ἀπ' οἰωνῶν φάτιν, κ. τ. λ.).

[I. 4.] Ἐλαῖον γένεσιν, πόνων ἀρωγὴν—ut cibi, non, sicut in posteris temporibus, gymnasii usus ministraret, cf. Psalm. civ. 15.

[I. 7.] Ὡν τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα.....κατεσκεύασαν. In communibus editionibus hic locus male interpungitur. Tu mecum sic legas et interpungas, Ὡν τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα πρέπει ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε ἔγῳ (ἴσμεν γάρ) οἱ τὸν βίον ἡμῶν κατεσκεύασαν—Quam sæpe hæc verba ἴσμεν γάρ in sententiis διακρίσεως ponuntur, non est qui ignoret: notius est quam ut exemplis illustretur.

[p. 283.] Ἡ γὰρ αὕτη πολιτεία καὶ τότε ἦν καὶ νῦν ἀριστοκρατία. Vide quæ in sub. præstantissimâ et longe longèque omnes alias supe-

rante historia de diversâ Græcorum πολιτεία Mitsfordius habet, tom. i. cap. iv. sect. 1. Locus est nimis longus ut exscribatur, et in compendium sine detrimento redigi non potest.

[l. 2.] Καλεῖ δὲ ὁ μὲν αὐτὴν δημοκρατίαν. cf. Thueyd. lib. ii. λ2. ubi Pericles in funebri suâ oratione ita loquitur, Χρῶμεθα γὰρ πολιτεία, οὗ ἐξηλούσῃ τοὺς τῶν πέλας νόμους· παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον ὄντες ἵσταν· ἡμῖνούμενοι ἐτέρους· καὶ ὄνομα μὲν, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰς ὁλίγους ἀλλ' εἰς πολλοὺς οἰκεῖν Δημοκρατία καλεῖται—ubi alii sed male legunt ἡκειν [q. sensum verbi οἰκεῖν.]

[l. 4.] Βασιλεῖς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ ἡμῖν εἰσιν. Quæ apud veteres Græcos plurimum valebat auctoritas, fuit regalis. Thueyd. A. iv. Ἀνατιωτέρας δὲ γενομένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων τὴν κτῆσιν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ποιουμένης, τὰ πολλὰ τυραννίδες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καθίσταντο, τῶν προσδῶν μειζόνων γιγνομένων· πρότερον δὲ ἦσαν ἐπὶ ῥήτοισι γέραςι πατρικαὶ βασιλείαι.

[l. 7.] Καὶ οὕτε ἀσθενεῖρ, κ. τ. λ. Pericles in fun. Orat. Thuc. Γ. ἔστι δὲ, κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους, πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τὸ ἴσον, ἡ δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ εἰδοκίμῃ, οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλεῖον ἢ τὰ κοινὰ ἢ ἀπ' ἀρετῆς προτιμᾶται· οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δὲ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν ἀξιώματος ἀφανείῃ κκώλυνται.

[l. 13.] "Ὅστε αὐτῶν ἀνώμαλοι καὶ αἱ πολιτεῖαι, τυραννίδες τὲ καὶ ὀλιγαρχίαι, ὁμαλὸς sen ὁμαλῆς planus, æqualis—ὁμαλῆς δῖαιτα æqualitas civilis; cui πλεονεξία opponitur, seu plus habendi, æquirendique cupiditas immodica, avaritiæque circumscribens, quæ sibi partem majorem justâ præcidit: est vitium ejus, qui in omni re præcipuum quippiam habere vult"—Budæus. cf. etiam de sententiâ Dem. Olynth. A. sect. β. ὅλως ὑπιστον ταῖς πολιτεῖαις ἡ τυραννίς.

[l. 16.] Οὐκ ἀξιοῦμεν δοῦλοι οὐδὲ δεσπότες ἀλλήλων εἶναι. Ad illustrandâ hæc verba asseram verba Xenophont. Cyrop. iii. p. 178. 37. οὐδένα ἀνθρώπων δεσπότην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε.

[p. 284.] "Ὁ τε χρόνος βραχύς ἀξίως διηγήσασθαι. i. e. ἂν βραχύς. Nimis angustum tempus est pro dignitate referre." Similia hujus constructionis exempla conguessit Wytenbachius ad Julianum in Bibliothecâ Crit. III. ii. 65. v. c. Xenophon. Cyrop. iv. 5. 8. ὁλίγοι ἔσμεν ὥστε ἐγκρατεῖς εἶναι αὐτῶν. Mem. Socr. III. 13. 3. ὅδωρ—ψυχρὸν ὥστε λούσασθαι, " Aqua frigidior quam ut quis eâ lavari possit." Platō Protag. p. 195. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔτι νέοι ὥστε τοσοῦτον πᾶγμα διελέσθαι. Euripid. Androm. p. 80. γέρων ἐκείνος, ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν παρών. "Senior est quam ut te præsens juvare possit," ubi plena esset locutio μᾶλλον γέρων (γεραιτέρος) ἔστιν ἐκείνος ἢ ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν παρών.

[p. 285. l. 1.] Τούτων περὶ μοι δοκεῖ χρῆναι ἐπιμνησθῆναι, ἐπαινοῦντά τε κ. τ. λ. Recte Tatiuss ad Medeam, v. 56. in Dalzelii collectaneis hæc annotat: "Cum dativus nominis præcedit, sequi potest accusativus adjectivi aut participii; at non versâ vice," quod quidem, addit Dalzelius, verum est tum apud Græcos tum apud Latinos scriptores. Utinam hujusce apud Latinos constructionis exempla paucius adduxisset! In Græcis ubique patent; satis est unum ex Iphig. in Aulide, v. 492. adhibuisse, quod non fecissem, nisi Marklandum levissimè (sed tamen ex levibus pendent magna) errantem vidissem.

Locus hic est. Ἄλλως τε μ' ἔλεος τῆς ταλαιπώρου κῆρης. Εἰσῆλθε, συγγένειαν ἔννοουμένῳ, ubi hæc habet Marklandus, "Forte ἔννοούμενον ut ver. 1374. οἱ εἰσῆλθὲν μ' ἔννοουμένην. Græcum foret εἰσῆλθέ μοι ἔννοουμένῳ: sed mihi non liquet μ' poni posse pro μοι." Nec potest: sed rem, vir doctissime, minus perspectè intellexisti: magis est Tragicorum more εἰσῆλθὲν με—ἔννοουμένῳ quam εἰσῆλθὲν με ἔννοουμένην scripsisse. Mutatio e casu genitivo ad accusativum satis rara occurrit in Demosthenis Olynth. B. η. Οὐ τοι σωφρονέων οἱ δὲ γενναίων ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων ἑλλείποντάς τι δι' ἔνδειαν χρημάτων ~~καὶ τοὺς~~ πολέμου, εὐχερῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα ὀνειδῆ φέρειν· οὐδ' ἐπὶ μὲν Κορινθίων καὶ Μεγαρίας, ἀπύσαντας τὰ ὅπλα πορεύεσθαι, Φιλίππον δ' ἔῃν πόλει· Ἐργκνίδας ἀνδραποδίσασθαι. Hoc uno excepto, nullum locum in promtu habeo ubi hæc casuum mutatio invenitur.

[l. 8.] Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ἰδεῖν, εἰ μέλλει τις καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενόμενον λόγῳ ὅτε πᾶσα μὲν, κ. τ. λ. Male hunc locum interpunxerunt et interpretati sunt editores. "Eam utique si quis recte laudaturus sit, oportet res ab illis eo tempore gestas respicere. ~~Quam~~ jam," &c. ubi interpres γενόμενον, quasi τὸ γενόμενον fuisset, intellexit. Tu necum sic construas et interpungas, Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ἰδεῖν, εἰ μέλλει τις καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενόμενον λόγῳ, ὅτε, κ. τ. λ. "Eam utique si quis recte laudaturus sit, oportet eum ad ea tempora animo procedentem videre, quum," &c. Hujus τοῦ γενέσθαι usús occurrit alterum in hac ipsâ oratione exemplum, p. 267. l. 6. ἐν τούτῳ δὴ ἂν τις γενόμενος γνώῃ οἷσι ἅρα ἐτόγγχανον ὄντες τὴν ἀρετὴν, κ. τ. λ. quem locum recte ad sensum, quavis non ad grammaticam constructionem verterunt editores. *Æschines* κατὰ Κτησιφώντος μή. Γέρεσθε δὴ μοι μικρὸν χρόνον τὴν διάνοιαν μὴ ἐν τῷ διαπτηρῷ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ νομίσατε ὅρῃν τὸν κήρυκα.—cf. *ibid.* 27. προέλλετε οὖν τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ εἰς τὴν στοὰν—*Thucyd.* lib. iii. μ. Γενόμενοι δὲ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ πάσχειν, καὶ ὡς πρὸ παντὸς ἂν ἐτιμήσασθε αὐτοὺς χειρώσασθαι, quem locum sic optime vertit in sua Anglica *Thucydidis* versione ille "*verus Musarum sacerdos*," [cf. *Toup. ad Long.*] *Herbertus Smith*, *Decanus Cestriensis*, "Figure to yourselves as strong as you can the miseries they designed you: remember how you wished for nothing in this world so much as to have them in your power."—Si meam hujusce loci interpretationem averseris, scias *Stephanum* totum locum sic refluxisse. Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ἰδεῖν εἰ μέλλει τις καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενομένην λόγῳ, ὅτε—*Leviori* mutatione huic loco, si locus non sit sanus et mihi certe sanissimus apparet, medebatur *Gottl.* ita ut post ἐπαινεῖν inseratur articulus τὸ et λόγῳ referatur ad ἐπαινεῖν.

[l. 9.] Ἡ Ἀσία ἐδούλευε τρίτῳ ἤδη βασιλεῖ, viz. *Dario Hystaspis filio*: nam *Cyrus Persarum imperium* munivit: hunc *Cambyses*, *Cambysen* breve post intervallum excipiebat *Darius*; hæc observatio *Edvardo Bentham* debetur, cujus editoris notæ laudem non meruerunt. *Æschylus* qui tunc temporis, quum *Asia* omnis tertio jam regi serviebat, floruit, Persicorum regum stemma sic deducit, ex quo licet intueri eum a Platone Platonisque defensore *Benthamo* multum discrepare—*Persæ*, v. 759—777. (Editionis *Schutzianæ*) *Εξ*

οὔτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἀναξ τήνδ' ὤπασεν, "Ἐν' ἄνδρ' ἀπάσης Ἀσιάδος μῆλο-
τρόφου Ταγείν, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυμήριον. Μῆδοι γὰρ ἦν ὁ πρῶτος
ἡγερῶν στρατοῦ· Ἄλλος δ' ἐκείνου παῖς τόδ' ἔργον ἤνυσεν, Φρένες γὰρ
αὐτοῦ θυμὸν οἰακοστρόφουν. Τρίτος δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κύρος, εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ,
Ἄρξας ἔθηκε πᾶσιν εἰρήνην φίλοις· Λυδῶν δὲ λαὸν καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐκτίσατο,
Ἰωνίαν τε πᾶσαν ἤλασεν βίᾳ· Θεοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἤχθηρεν, ὥς εὐφρων ἔφν.
Κύρου δὲ παῖς, τέταρτος ἠΐθινεν στρατόν. Πέμπτος δὲ Μέρδης ἤρξεν,
αἰσχύνῃ πάτρῃ, Θρόνοισί τ' ἀρχαίοισι τὸν δὲ [mel. τόνδε] σὺν δόλῳ
Ἄρταφρένης ἐκτείνειν ἐσθλὰς ἐν δόμοις, Ξὺν ἀνδράσιν· φίλοισιν, οἷς τόδ'
ἦν χρέος. Ἐκτος δὲ Μάραφς, ἔβδομός τ' Ἄρταφρένης. Κἀγὼ [sc. Darius,
qui loquitur] πάλου τ' ἔκυρσα, τοῦπερ ἤθελον, Κάπεσπράτευσσα πολλὰ
σὺν πολλῷ στρατῷ—ubi notandum est me in versu 771. Rutgersii
emendationem τοῦ Μέρδης pro Μάρδος accepisse; "nomen enim Mardi
in Persicarum regum serie," verbis utor Brunckianis, "nullibi com-
paret." Ex Herodoto satis notus Σμερδς est. Nominis primam lite-
ram, extrivit metri necessitas, quod in aliis vocibus usitatum est ut
in ἡμέρῃς soni verbo σμερδω, μέρδω. Emendationi favet Scholiastes.

Hæc pro specimine, ut verba Burgesii usurpem, sufficiant: alio
tempore telam quam orsi sumus persequemur.

G. T. X.

NOTICE OF

A GRAMMAR of the PERSIAN LANGUAGE, comprising a portion of ARABIC Inflection, together with some observations on the structure of either Language, considered with reference to the Principles of General Grammar. By M. LUMSDEN, LL.D. Professor of Arabic and Persian in the College of Fort William, in Bengal. 2 Vols. fol. Calcutta, 1810.

WE cannot better explain the motives which induced the author, to undertake this elaborate work on Persian Grammar, than by offering the following extract from his own Preface: a brief outline of the subject matter will afterwards be added from the Table of Contents, and in some future Number of our Journal we may probably be induced to offer a few remarks upon the intricate, but novel, and interesting subjects of discussion, with which the ingenious author has in so remarkable a manner characterized his work.

"The public," says Dr. Lumsden,¹ "have long been in possession of several Persian Grammars, among the number of which that written by Sir W. Jones has obtained the greatest share of celebrity. The work of Sir W. Jones was composed in England about forty years ago, in the very infancy of our progress in the study of the language and literature of Persia, and whatever merits or defects may be imputed to this popular performance, it must be admitted to have extended in a very eminent degree the number of European votaries to that department of oriental study.

"How it contributed to this effect, it is not necessary to inquire here. My opinion of its execution is by no means favorable, but I respect the memory of Sir W. Jones, and am entirely disposed to admit that the obvious and, perhaps at that time, insuperable difficulties with which he had to contend, are more than sufficient to account for his failure, if indeed he can be said to have failed in a work which has been always distinguished by the public favor, (conceded perhaps to the poetical talents and taste of the author,) though not at all remarkable, in my judgment, for the essential merit of instructive excellence.

"The work of Sir W. Jones was followed, after an interval of many years, by the publication of Mr. Gladwin's PERSIAN MOONSHEE; a performance in which for the first time some of the elements of Arabic Inflection were selected and arranged for the useful purpose of facilitating the study of the Persian language. Notwithstanding the merit of that and other performances of the same author, for whose

¹ See Preface, p. 1 and 2.

labors I am happy in this opportunity of professing my esteem, an opinion continued to prevail in the minds of many oriental scholars that much yet remained to be done for the elucidation of the principles of Persian Grammar. Admitting the accuracy of that opinion, the acknowledged importance of the Persian language demanded an attempt to supply the deficiency, and if such an attempt were admitted to be necessary, its execution could be no where so reasonably expected as from some of the members of the College of Fort William.

"I happened to be the only member of the Arabic and Persian departments of the College, who had leisure from other pursuits to devote to the compilation of a Persian Grammar; but though the task was deemed to be of easy accomplishment by those who had little knowledge of the subject, I was well aware of its many difficulties, and ignorant only of the means by which those difficulties have, as I trust, been since overcome. I would therefore have willingly conceded to the superior knowledge and talents of others, the merit and labor of a work to which I was prompted by no impulse of inclination whatever; but as it was imposed by a sense of public duty, so it has been conducted throughout, I will venture to say, with an industry of research every where equal to the occasion of its exertion, and often rewarded with no ordinary success."

We now proceed to the plan and arrangement of the materials as given by the author himself. "The science of Grammar," he observes, "is every where divided into the two branches of INFLECTION and SYNTAX, the first treating of the *formation* of words; and the second of their *application* to the purposes of speech. The materials of both are precisely the same, but the object to be accomplished is obviously different in either case. It is the business of INFLECTION to arrange in their proper order, every class of words that may happen to enter into the composition of a given language; to define the specific difference existing between them; and to detail the rules applicable to the *formation* of each class. It is the business of SYNTAX to consider in the same order the application of these words to the purposes of speech."

The first volume accordingly is devoted to INFLECTION, and comprises the following heads:—The Persian Alphabet and System of Orthography—Of Numeral Letters—Of the Terms by which certain letters of the alphabet are distinguished from each other—Permutation of letters. Of the Infinitive and the formation of the Tenses—Inflection of Verbs—Terms of Grammar—Of Arabic Words—Preliminary remarks (on the permutation of Arabic Letters)—Rules for the permutation and rejection of Humza—Rules for the permutation and rejection of Alif, Wao, and Ya—Rules for the Coalescence of the Letters—Concluding Remarks—Division and Classification of Arabic Nouns—Primitive Infinitives of the Triliteral Class—Derivative Nouns—Increased Infinitives of the Triliteral Class—Quadriliteral Infinitives of the radical Class—Increased Infinitives of the Quadriliteral Class—Properties of the Conjugations—Of Jaumids—Relative Nouns—Arti-

cial Infinitives—Of Gender—Of Number—Formation of the Dual Number—Perfect Plural—Imperfect Plural—The Plural of Paucity—The Plural of Multitude—The last of Plurals—Noun of the Plural—Conclusion—Of the formation of the singular Number, by adding certain letters to Nouns which have naturally a Plural Sense—Of Nouns defective in the Singular Number—Of Arabic Plurals used by the Persians in the sense of the Singular Number—Of the Principles of Analysis—Of certain Arabic Words and Sentences that are of common use in the Persian Language—Conclusion—Of Persian Nouns—Isme Masdar—Isme Fael or Active Participle—Isme Mufool or Passive Participle—Isme Hal—Sefute Mooshubbuha—Isme Zarf or Noun of Time and Place—Isme Tufzeet or Noun of Superiority—Isme Tusgher or Diminutive Noun—Isme Munsoob or Persian Relative—Of Terminations—Formation of the Plural Numbers.

In this volume we would particularly direct the reader's attention to Dr. Lumsden's ingenious observations on the Division and Classification of Arabic Nouns, p. 136, including his Definition of an ARABIC INFINITIVE, and remarks on the nature of ADJECTIVES, PARTICIPLES and EPITHETS, as classed together under the general term *صفات* or ATTRIBUTES; and lastly to his PRINCIPLES OF ANALYSIS, p. 383, which seem intended by the author to overthrow some of the favorite dogmas of Horne Tooke, on the true nature and logical division of the Parts of Speech.

The Contents of the *Second* Volume are as follow:

Introductory Chapter—Of Particles—Plan of the Syntax—Composition and Division of Sentences—Of Personal Pronouns—Disjunctive Personal Pronouns—Reciprocal Pronouns—Demonstrative Nouns—The Relative Pronoun—Interrogative Pronouns—Noun of Time and Place—Generic Nouns, (including the use of Articles.) Proper Names—Nouns of Number—Collective Nouns—Kenayati—Aswaut—Ithaa—Subject and Predicate—Fael or Agent to an Active or Neuter Verb—Nominative to a Verb in the Passive Voice—Object of an Active and Transitive Verb—Universal Object—Vocative—Haul or Noun employed to describe the state of the Agent or object of a Verb—Tumeez or Noun of Discrimination—Corroboration—Exchange of one Word for another—The Relation of the Genitive Case—Substantive Nouns accompanied by Attributives of any kind—Noun of Superiority—Of the Verbal Character—Imperfect Verbs—Perfect Verbs—Application of Tenses—The Imperative Mood—The Prohibitive—General Principle—On Verbs considered as Active or Neuter—On the interchange of Persons—Occasional Omission of Persian Verbs—The relation existing between the *شرط* and the *جرا*—Of Particles—Of the significance of certain Letters of the Alphabet—Of Persian Particles and other Words comprising more than one letter.

The mere contents of this volume as stated in the above table, may satisfy the oriental scholar as to the magnitude and importance of the matter contained in Dr. Lumsden's Grammar. It is certainly a very different work from any that we have ever seen on the subject of Lan-

guage, not excepting even the voluminous Treatise of Vossius, or the still more recondite philosophical dissertation of Harris. It presents, as he himself observes, 'a complete Map of the Persian Language'—not merely a rude outline, but an effective body of Rules and Examples from the authority of which there ought to be no appeal.'

The observations scattered through the body of the work on the structure of the Persian and Arabic Languages, considered with reference to the principles of general Grammar, are extremely ingenious and interesting, and well merit the attentive consideration of every true critic. Mr. Lumsden has found it necessary to oppose some of the long standing Theories of European Writers on language, and has combated with no ordinary skill the favorite doctrine of Horne Tooke, on the true nature and use of Particles, the structure of the Arabic Language, presenting in his opinion, an insuperable barrier against the admission of Tooke's principles on the broad basis of Universal Grammar.

خبر الکلام ماقل وذل is a very excellent motto, and we doubt not that Dr. Lumsden had some good reason for applying it to his book. To be sure ELEVEN HUNDRED FOLIO PAGES may not be deemed by every one a very remarkably laconic essay, but the author may have intended the words as a compliment to the *perspicuous brevity* of the Persian Tongue, and if that were his intention, we give him full credit for the unambiguous motto he has chosen for his second volume.

پیش ازین گفته اند اهل سلف
عذر من صنف قد استهدف

T.

NOTICE OF

THE MEGHA DUTA, or "CLOUD MESSENGER," a Poem in the Sanscrit Language: by CALIDASA. Translated into English Verse, with Notes and Illustrations: by HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, Assistant Surgeon in the service of the Honorable East India Company, and Secretary to the Asiatic Society. Calcutta, 1813. 4to. 132 pages.

THERE is reason to believe that the very high encomium bestowed on this work by the late Lord Minto,¹ had excited in many persons

¹ See the "Public Disputation of the Students of the College of Fort William," &c. 20th Sept. 1813.—pp. 39. 40. &c.

here a strong desire of perusing it, long before any copies reached this country. We have now the pleasure of announcing, that the *Megha Duta* has not only arrived in England, but most completely establishes its claim to the praises which it received from the noble and ingenious critic abovementioned.

The limits prescribed to us in the present number of the *Classical Journal* will not admit a particular notice of the various beauties which embellish the "*Cloud Messenger*:" we shall therefore content ourselves here, with a brief account of the plot, which may best be given in the words of Mr. Wilson's own "argument." (p. xi.)

"A *Yacsha*, or demigod so called, and a servant of the *Hindu* god of wealth, *Cuvera*, had incurred the displeasure of his lord, by neglecting a garden intrusted to his charge, and allowing it to be injured by the entrance of *Airavata*, the elephant of *Indra*, deity of the firmament: as a punishment for his offence, he was condemned to twelve months' banishment from *Alaca*, the city of the *Yacshus*, and consequent separation from his home and wife. 'The seat of his exile is the mountain *Ramagiri*, and upon the opening of the poem, he is supposed to have passed a period of eight months in solitary seclusion: the poem opens at the commencement of the rainy season, when heavy clouds are gathering in the south, and proceeding in a northerly course, or towards the *Himala* mountains, and the fictitious position of the residence of the *Yacshas*. 'To one of these the distressed demigod addresses himself, and desires the cloud to waft his sorrows to a beloved and regretted wife. For this purpose, he first describes the route which the messenger is to pursue, and this gives the poet an opportunity of alluding to the principal mountains, rivers, temples, &c. that are to be met with on the road from *Ramagiri* to *Onjein*, and thence nearly due north, to the *Himalaya*, or "snowy mountains." 'The fabulous mountain *Cailasa*, and the city of *Cuvera*, *Alaca*, which are supposed to be in the central part of the snowy range, are next described, and we then come to the personal description of the *Yacsha's* wife. The cloud is next instructed, how to express the feelings and situation of the exile, and he is then dismissed from the presence of the deity, and the poem of *Calidasa*."

The banished *Yacsha*, after due oblations, thus addresses the cloud, —(line 37.)

"Hail! friend of *Indra*, counsellor divine,
 Illustrious offspring of a glorious line;
 Wearer of shapes at will; thy worth I know,
 And bold entrust thee with my fated woe.
 For better far solicitation fail
 With high desert, than with the base prevail.
 Thou art the wretch's aid, affliction's friend;
 To me, unfortunate, thy succour lend:
 My lonely state compassionate behold,
 Who mourn the vengeance of the god of gold:

Condemned amidst these dreary rocks to pine,
And all I wish, and all I love resign.

Where dwell the *Yacshas* in their sparkling fields,
And *Sina's* crescent groves surrounding gilds,
Direct thy licensed journey, and relate
To her who mourns in *Alaca* my fate :
There shalt thou find the partner of my woes,
True to her faith, and stranger to repose :
Her task to weep our destiny severe,
And count the moments of the lingering year :
A painful life she leads ; but still she lives,
While Hope its aid invigorating gives ;
For female hearts, though fragile as the flower,
Are firm when closed by Hope's investing power."

The Sanscrit text accompanies in each page Mr. Wilson's translation, and the obscure or most interesting passages are illustrated with a multiplicity of notes that sufficiently bespeak his critical knowledge of the Sanscrit tongue — his extensive reading and rich stores of miscellaneous information. We shall transcribe the note on verse 39. in the passage above quoted, " *Wearer of shapes at will.*" — " Or *Camaraupa*, from *kam*, desire, and *rup*, form, shape ; -- thus, *Socrates* in the Clouds,

" Σοκ. Ἐννοῦται παρ' ὅτι βόλωνται.

" Soc. Why then,

Clouds can assume what shapes they will, believe me."

Cumberland's Translation.

and the note on verse 40. (" For better far solicitation fail," &c.) — This is a sentiment of rather an original strain, and indicates considerable elevation of mind ; something of the same kind occurs in Massinger's play of the *Bondman*, where Pisander says,

" I'd rather fall under so just a judge,
Than be acquitted by a judge corrupt,
And partial in his censure."

Although obliged to restrict this notice to very narrow limits, we cannot refrain from extracting some lines of the *Yacsha's* instructions to his celestial messenger, (v. 315. p. 85.)

" These be thy guides ; and faithfully preserve
The marks I give thee ; or e'en more ; observe,
Where painted emblems holy wealth design,
Cucra's treasures : that abode is mine.
Haply its honors are not now to boast ;
Dimmed by my fate, and in my exile lost.
For when the sun withdraws his cheering rays,
Faint are the charms the *Camala* displays.
To those loved scenes repaired, that awful size,
Like a young elephant, in haste disguise,

Lest terror seize my fair one, as thy form
 Hangs o'er the hillock and portends the storm.
 Thence to the inner mansion bend thy sight,
 Diffusing round a mild and quivering light,
 As when through evening shades soft flashes play,
 Where the bright fire-fly wings his glittering way.
 There in the fane a beauteous creature stands,
 The first best-work of the Creator's hands,
 Whose slender limbs inadequately bear
 A full-orbed bosom, and a weight of care ;
 Whose teeth like pearls, whose lips like bimbos show,
 And fawn-like eyes still tremble as they glow.
 Lone as the widowed *Chacravaci* mourns,
 Her faithful memory to her husband turns,
 And sad and silent shalt thou find my wife,
 Half of my soul, and partner of my life,
 Nipped by chill sorrow, as the flowers enfold
 Their shrinking petals from the withering cold.
 I view her now ! long weeping swells her eyes,
 And those dear lips are dried by parching sighs.
 Sad on her hand her pallid cheek declines,
 And half unseen through veiling tresses shines.
 As when a darkling night the moon enshrouds,
 A few faint rays break straggling through the clouds.
 Now at thy sight, I mark fresh sorrows flow,
 And sacred sacrifice augments her woe ;
 I mark her now, with fancy's aid retrace
 This wasted figure, and this haggard face ;
 Now from her favorite bird she seeks relief,
 And tells the tuneful *Narica* her grief,
 Mourns o'er the feathered prisoner's kindred fate,
 And fondly questions of its absent mate.
 In vain the lute for harmony is strung,
 And round the robe-neglected shoulder slung,
 And faltering accents strive to catch in vain
 Our race's old commemorative strain ;
 The falling tear, that from reflection springs,
 Corrodes incessantly the silvery strings.
 Recurring woe still pressing on the heart,
 The skilful hand forgets its grateful art,
 And idly wandering strikes no measured tone,
 But wakes a sad, wild warbling of its own."

On the verse 532, (" *The first best work*," &c.) Mr. Wilson remarks,
 Literally the first creation of *Brahma* : and *first* may refer to time,
 or to degree—it most probably here means *best*. So Milton, speaking
 of Eve,

' Oh fairest of creation, last and best
 Of all God's works.' *Parad. Lost*, ix. 896."

On verse 535, he observes, that "the *Bimba*, (*Bryonia grandis*) bears a red fruit, to which the lip is very commonly compared."

On verse 537, that "the *Chacaraci* is the ruddy goose (*Anas Casarca*) more commonly known in India by the appellation *Brahmany duck*, or *goose*. These birds are always observed to fly in pairs during the day, but are supposed to remain separate during the night," &c.

On verse 543, (" *Long weeping swells her eyes.*")—"In this she resembles the *Lesbia* of *Catullus*,

'Flendo turbiduli rubent ocelli.'

'Her swollen eyes are red with weeping.'

On verse 557, (" *In vain the lute.*")—"The lute is here put for the *Veena* or *Been*, a stringed instrument of sacred origin and high celebrity amongst the *Hindus*."

On verse 558, "*Robe-neglected* is here put for *dirty clothes*. So *Laodameia* says,

'Quà possum squalore tuos imitata labores.'

'And with my squalid vesture ape thy toils.'

To gratify our readers who have sympathised with the unfortunate demigod, we shall quote the six last lines of the poem.

"This said, he ceased : the messenger of air

Conveyed to *Alaca* his wild despair ;

The god of wealth, relenting, learned his state,

And swift curtailed the limit of his fate,

Removed the curse ; restored him to his wife,

And blest with ceaseless joy their everlasting life."

We learn that a cheaper edition of this poem has been printed in octavo, without the Sanscrit text, and that the ingenious translator now devotes his leisure hours to the composition of a Sanscrit and English Dictionary. On this great undertaking, we congratulate the public, as general science and literature will undoubtedly be promoted by such a work ; but thousands of our readers will probably wish that Mr. Wilson had left to others the more laborious, though perhaps more useful, employment of lexicographical compilation, and still continued to transfuse the beauties of eastern poetry into English verse, a task for which he seems to be so eminently qualified.

M. Y.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

THE word *man*, says Parkhurst in his Hebrew Lexicon, "is frequently used as the name of that miraculous bread from heaven,

with which Jehovah fed the Israelites in the wilderness, *Manna*. At its first falling Exod. xvi. 15. *The children of Israel—said מַנָּה this (is) a particular species, a particular thing, for they knew not what it was;* and in our English version of the Bible it is rendered—"It is manna; for they knew not what it was." The Bishop of ELY, in his Commentary on the Historical Books of Moses, gives a very different account of it, and thinks the meaning is—"this is the gift of God, or this is it which God hath appointed us." See Vol. I. p. 252. Why so simple a phrase as מַנָּה should have been thus mistaken, I cannot imagine. It appears to me to be a common interrogative, meaning,—*what is it?* and as such was understood by the LXX, who render it τί ἐστὶ τούτο; Parkhurst's mistake, and indeed the mistake of almost all the modern Commentators on the subject, appears to have arisen from confounding together the pronoun, the preposition, and the substantive noun. In the sentence produced by Parkhurst, 1 Kings, xviii. 5. and translated by him *species or kind*, it is a mere preposition; in the above interrogative phrase, a pronoun, and in all the other examples from the Bible, when applied as the name of the ἀερόμελα, the *manna*, or bread from heaven, it is a substantive noun, and means a *divine gift or favor*. Let us consider the circumstances which led to this name.

The Israelites murmured against the Lord and said—"Ye have brought us forth into this wilderness to kill this whole assembly with hunger; then the Lord said unto Moses, behold, I will rain bread from Heaven for you." c. xvi. 3, 4. This, which appeared in the ground, "a small round thing, as small as the hoarfrost," v. 14. the Israelites when they first saw, "said one to another מַנָּה *what is it?* for they knew not what it was." Moses answered—"This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat," v. 15. "And the House of Israel named it (in consequence) a *divine gift or favor* (מַנָּה)" v. 31.

The word مَنّ in Arabic is applied exactly in the above sense, and مَنَّان a derivative from the same root, means *munificent*, and with the article, is as an epithet of the Deity, to denote the *munificent*, the *bountiful*,—as اللَّهُ تَعَالَى الْمَنَّانُ. *God the most high and munificent*, and hence perhaps, (as observed before in my remarks on a passage in Virgil,) the origin of the Latin *munus*, a *sacred gift or oblation*.

A. LOCKETT.

London, 28th Nov. 1815.

RICHARDI BENTLEII
 Epistolæ Duæ
 AD
 T. I. HEMSTERHUSIUM.

CLARISSIMO VIRO,
 TIB. HEMSTERHUSIO

S. P. D.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS.

No. II.—*Continued from No. xxiii. p. 161.*

JAM septimana, credo, effluxit, ex quo literas tuas optatissimas per adolescentem Danum accepi, in quibus serio videris laborare, ut a negligentia te crimine purges, quod epistolio a me olim accepto tam sero demum rescriperis. Næ tu parum adhuc me nosti, si aut id me credis succensuisse; aut adeo irasci facilem, ut tam operosa excusatione tibi opus fuerit. Non enim tam grande premium emendatiunculis meis statuere soleo, ut singularem aliquam gratiam inde sperem, aut exigam. Facile enim et quasi sponte mihi solent subnasci: et iniquum plane est, quod minimo mihi labore constet, id postulare magnæ gratiæ mihi apponi. Tu tamen haud contentus exquisitissimis verbis grates mihi persolvere etiam elegantissimo Lucianei libelli munere demereri me voluisti. Quin, ut magis magisque in tuo ære sim, variantes Flacci lectiones ex codice scripto polliceris, accurata tua opera describendas. Enimvero ob tam prolixam tuam humanitatem, non dici potest, quam devinctum tibi me ac obstrictum habeas. Scias autem, amice præstantissime, me ejusdem Franekeriani libri lectiones e bibliotheca Franciana emtas a Præsule Eliensi dudum habuisse: quas tamen indiligenter et perfunctorie descriptas esse satis mihi compertum est. Tu, sat scio, longe plures et fideliores inde depromeres: neque tamen, cum meliores aliquot Codices aliunde sim nactus, operæ pretium fuerit te isto labore et tædio cruciari. Si ipsius Codicis (quod Anchersenius non desperare jussit) vel biduum tantummodo mihi copia fieri posset; crediderim equidem nonnihil fructus ad editionem nostram inde perventurum. Ego enim vel ex ipsis literis multa expiscari possem, quæ alius cujusvis Animadversionum mearum inscii et oculos et mentem fugere est necesse. Tu, quod

commodo tamen tuo fiat, experieris, an ex claustris Bibliothecæ codex ille huc evolare potuerit.

Ceterum ob nitidam illam et magnificam Pollucis editionem (cujus exemplar continuo ut prodiit mihi comparavi) quas tibi gratias satis dignas referemus? Deus bone, quæ industria, quæ eruditio, quod judicium, quod acumen, quæ fides ubique elucet? Unum tibi defuisse doleo (quod a vera amicitia profectum æquis auribus accipies) majorem rei Metricæ peritiam. Cum enim cetera in Polluce fere omnia non ita magno labore expediri et restitui possint ex aliis Lexicis; in fragmentis vero Poëtarum, quæ subinde adducuntur, recte refingendis is demum arduus sit labor et periculosus: hæc qui sine rei metricæ doctrina ausit attingere, perinde est, ac si in Labyrinthum se conjecerit, sine fili præsidio exitum tentaturus. Certe qui syllabarum omnium quantitatem et omnigenorum versuum mensuram in numerato habet, ei πόριμα erunt multa et facilia, quæ aliis hac scientia destitutis prorsus sunt ἄπορα. Quare obsecro te, vir eximie, et magnopere hortor, ut et hanc eruditionis partem ceteris, quas cumulate adeo possides, velis adjungere; grande, mihi crede, operæ pretium et mirificam quandam voluptatem inde laturus. Animos autem tibi addat, documentoque sit celeberrimus noster Kusterus; qui ubi primum in Britanniam appulit Editioni Suidæ manum admoturus, Prosodiz vero ultra Hexametros et Elegiacos fere imperitus, me auctore et suasore, sedulam huic doctrinæ operam navavit. Quid autem ille eximium siue in Suida, quem emendatissimum dedit, siue in Aristophane, quem nunc in manibus habet, perficere potuisset? Nihil certe in ejusmodi fragmentis absque hac ope proferre, immo ne de aliorum quidem conjecturis judicare et cognoscere licet. Quamobrem, etsi paullum otii nactus dieculam hanc tibi impendere statui, et integrum Pollucis librum decimum percurrere, quem tu jure omnium difficillimum esse questus es; haud tamen mirer, si quæ ego pro certissimis habeo, tibi, ut nunc est, incerta, dubia, falsa videantur. Ea tamen postea, ubi in Metrica arte versator fueris, τῶν ἐπὶ Σάγγρα clariora tibi visum iri, haud vanus vates prænuntio.

X. 11. Ridicule Kuhnii, in Prosodia plane hospes, et Jurgermanno longe inferior; Καὶ -σκεύη οἰκητήρια. Senarius ille sic legi et distinguere debuit, Καὶ ναὶ μὲν Δί' ἄλλα σκευάρι' οἰκητήρια. Sect. 12. Menandri locum sic lege,

——— ὅς' ἐστὶ μαλακὰ συλλαβῶν,

Ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τὸ σύνολον ἐκπῆδα φίλος.

Necessarius est hic iambus φίλος ex MSS. non stare potest spondeus βᾶττον. *Vasa tua colligens, amice, exili ex urbe.* In Diphili loco, male factum, quod ἐκ δόμου in textu posueris pro vulgato ἐκράμει. Sic totum refinge:

——— εἶτα μαλακὸν, ὦ δύστην', ἔχεις

Σκευάριον, ἐκπαράσιον, ἀργυρίδιον.

οὐκ ἐκδραμῇ λαβὼν τόδε, καὶ δώσεις ἐμοὶ
Παρακαταθήκη;

Ἐκδραμῇ Atticum pro ἐκδραμῇ ab ἐκδραμοῦμαι. Cetera jam facilia.
Sect. 17. Aristophanis locus sic ponendus:

—καὶ τὸν ἅμ' ἅπαντα μου
"Ἐχέουσι καὶ τὰν ἀφ' ἑσέων—

Id Alexidis ibidem, Πῶ δέ με ἄγεις διὰ τῶν κύκλων, sic rescribe,
A. Πῶ δὲ μ' ἄγεις; B. διὰ τῶν κύκλων. Dialogus est, *Qua me du-
cis? per cyclos.* Recte Vulgati πῶ *qua*, non ποῖ *quo*. Sequentem
autem Diphili locum credo me antea tentasse, ut conjicio ex tua
Epistola. Meæ enim exemplar non servavi, neque nunc, quid
scripserim, memini. Locus autem sic constituendus videtur:

Καὶ προσέτι τῶν ἐσχέσαν, κλίνην, κάδον,
Στεφάνηματα, σίγυνον, ἀσκόπηραν, βύλακον.
Ὁ: που στρατιώτην ἂν τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλον
Ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς δευθὰ καθίζειν ὑπολάβοι.
Τοιοῦτος ἐστὶ ὁ ῥάπος, ὃν σὺ περιφέρεις.

Κλίνην tu recte pro καὶ γὰρ Epitheton enim hic locum non
habet. Pro σὺνδὴν sine dubio reponere σίγυνον inde militi eum com-
parat. Quodsi et antea σίγυνον in Epistola emendaverim, illud in-
dicio erit, veram esse conjecturam, quæ bis ex intervallo in mentem
venerit. Porro Sect. 21. locus *Antiphanis* (sic enim recte MSS. et
plura hujus et Diphili fragmenta apud Athenæum extant, quæ ex
hujusmodi γλωσσικῆς et affectatis vocabulis quærant risum; nulla
Aristophanis, qui odio habebat illa ζεστικά) ad Senarios redigendus
est, et Kuhnium audimus. Dii boni! ne vestigium quidem sena-
ri est in tribus illis, quos concinnavit, ut plane nauseam mihi mo-
vent. Tu vero tetrametros Trochaicos sic refinge et colloca:

A. Ἄν κελὺν με σταθμοῦχος. B. ὁ σταθμοῦχος δ' ἐστὶ τις;
Ἀπορνίζεις: σὺ δὲ με κλίνην πρὸς; με διάλεκτον λαλῶν.
A. Εἰ πῖτάττει μοι στέγας χις.

Bine, ut vides, sunt personæ; quarum prior novo vocabulo
utitur σταθμοῦχος pro οἰκοδ. σπότυ; quod altera se negat intelligere.
Prior vero ineptire pergit; et quasi σαφίστερόν τι dicturus, aliud ver-
bum adhibet æque ignotum. Nam ἂν κελὺν με σταθμοῦχος, et (ex
nostra Emendatione) εἰ πῖτάττει μοι στέγας χις, idem significant.
Sect. 33. Locus Aristophanis, τί μ' ῥώπῃς ἐξαρτίζεις ὥσπερ κλιντήριον,
mendosus est sine dubio. Sed corrigendi viam certam non possum
inire; quia τὸ μέτρον hic non agnosco. Sect. 35. legerim, ex Scirone
Satyrico:

Σχιδὸν χαμῆν σύμμετρος Κορινθίας.
Παιδὲς, κεφάλου δ' οὐκ ὑπερτενὲς πόδα.

σδυμῆτρος εἰ τῇ χαμῆν; non procerior ea lectulo Corinthiæ cujusvis
ancilla. Sed hæc aptius conveniunt Procrustæ (scis historiam)
quam Scironi; adeo ut forte in eadem fabula de utroque pœnas
sumserit Thescus. Sect. 39. Aristophanis ἐν δὲ Δαναΐσι, τῶν χειρῶν

ἔργα μὴ ἔστι. Nulla hic sententia, nullum metrum. Nimirum sunt verba Pollucis, (non Comici) et sic corrigenda: 'Εν δ' Ἀπναίσιν τὰ χηρῶν περὶ μὲν ἔστι. In Danaism μὴ ἔστι anserum plumam significat. Atque hoc verum est. Ibid. ἀπαγε Ἰνδὸν Hyperidris ὑπὲρ νικα,; quod temere in textum receperisti ex insulsa conjectura Kuhnii. Quis dubitet post ὑπὲρ sequi viri nomen; ut in reliquis Hyperidris terque quaterque apud Harpocrationem. Ergo Ἰνδὸν pro μίκα: οὐ enim a sequente ἀνιμάζειν facile absorberi potuit. Sect. 41. Ὀνητο etc. Placet vulgatum ἀνητὼν; et sic constitue,

Ὀνητῶν τὸ ἔρμα τοῦ θεοῦ—
ῥαψας ὑπὸν

Σόξαι κενεῶλιν.

Jam in illo Chionida: Sect. 43, Πολλοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἔκ ἀκούω κατὰ στυνίας quod in metri legem gravissime peccat, beasti quod corrupta illa Falkenburgiani codicis ἐγὼ ἔκ ακὺ et ἄτ γυνὴ non invidisti nobis: Ecce enim ex illis rudibus veram tibi lectionem praesto:

Πολλοὶ ἐγὼ δ' ακὺ κατὰ στυνίας
Φρουροῦντα ἀλὺχνους, γὰρ σάμακι κ' ἱμαμένους.

Noti, inquit, multos adolescentes, atque eos non tuae sortis, vel, non tui similes, excubantes sine lucerna, et super arundinem dormientes. Ἀλυχνος eodem sensu Euripidi dictum apud nostrum VII. 178.

Κοίλοις ἐν ἄντροις ἀλυχνός, ὡς περὶ θύρας, μόνος.

Sect. 46. in illo Antiphantis pro ἢ χαλκοῖς, vel, ut Aldi editio, οὐ χαλκοῖς supra extat in IV. 183. εἰς ἀποτίμω. Et sane cum ἡδὲ adverbium hic convenit: lege

— κατεσκαμμένους
Ἰαυνοῦ τ' ἀπὸν ἱατροῦ ἢ ὀχλῶν. πάντοτε,
ἰουτηγίῳσιν, ἐξαλίπτροι, καλὰ καὶ ἴσιν,
Σικύασις, ὑπεβήτοισιν—

Sect. 55 Strattidis versus sic in ordinem redigendi sunt; non ut Kuhnii dedit absurdissime; ut confidentiam quidem hominis mirer, qui id ausus sit profiteri, quod nec hilam intelligebat,

— πρό-δ' ἄγε
Τὸν πῶλον ἀτρεῖμα, προσλαβὼν τὴν ἀγωγέα
Βραχύτερον οὐχ ὁρᾷ, ὅ-δ' ἴβ' ἵκε ἐπὶ ἔτι;

Π' ὅθ' ἄγε, producit equum placide: et quoque necessarium est sententiae et versui, ab ἔτι absorptum est Sect. 58. Locum Philylli, in quo solemiter delirat Kuhnii, sic restitue: Καὶ πινακίδα ὅ-δ' εὐροῖς ἐν ταῖς Φιλυλλίου Πύλαις, λ-γ-ι γέ τοι Δωρίδαν,
Ἐκ τῶς πινακίδος ἀνπερέας, ὅτι καὶ λ-γ-οῖ
Τὰ γρομμάτ', ἐρμύνου.

Πινακίδα, inquit, invenitur Philylli Πόλιν. dicitur autem Dorice, Interpretare tu clare ex tabula, quid litera significet. Vides, opinor, Dorismum ex τὰς et ἀμπέρω. (αφῶς, idem quod διαμπερῶς, vide Hesych.) Nimirum persona hic inducitur vernacula lingua utens Dorica; unde Πόλιν credo nomen dramati inditum: quod variarum urbium cives ibi quique dialecto ibi loquebantur. Sect.

62. Antiphanis locus est : ubi *Ξυνακόλουθος* a versu repudiatur. Eleganter et vere Salmasius *Ἀξυνακόλουθος*, *Ξηρὸς*, *αὐτολήκυθος*. i. e. *incomitatus*, quod *ονιν* in textum recipiendum erat. Poteris etiam sic refingere,

Ξυνακόλουθεις Ξηρὸς, αὐτολήκυθος.

Sed alterum illud sententiæ videtur aptius. Sect. 63. Optime dedit locum Eupolidis Jungermannus, ex necessitate metri,

Ὅστις πύλιν ἤκεις ἔχων καὶ χαλκίον,

Ὅσπερ λεγὼ στρατιάτις ἐξ Ἴωνίας.

Clara sententia, *Qui urnam et alienum portas : tanquam puerpera Ionica, castra sequens*. Nempe in Ionia, ubi disciplina militaris non admodum vigeat, mos erat, ut uxores comitarentur suos maritos militantes : ubi si quæ forte peperisset, vasa circumferebat balneatoria. At bonus vir, Kuhnius, *στρατιώτης* hic in senario ponit : quod perinde est, ac si sic in Virgilio legendum contenderet, *Tityre tu patula recumbens sub tegmine fagi*. Vides, opinor, *ὡ φίλη κεφαλή*, quantivis esse pretii leges metricas rite callere. Sect. 64. Locus *Æschyli*, *Λίνα δὲ πῖσσα καὶ ἀμολίνου μακροτόνοι*. Sine dubio senarius erat, sed *λίνα* stare hic non potest, cum posteriorem corripiat ; at *λίνα* a *λινούς* optime : tum autem requiretur substantivum plurale. Lege igitur, si libet,

Λίνα δὲ γείσσα, κώμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι.

Hesychius in *Γείσα*, *ἐνιοὶ δὲ*, inquit, *τὰς ὡὰς τοῦ ἐνδύματος γείσσα λέγουσιν*, ita ibi legendum, non *γείσσαξ*. *Λίνεα*, inquit, *σινδύρια, et crudi lini tenia*. Sed, cum Editio Aldina habeat *λινάες πίσσα*, et Codd. MSS. *λίνα δὲ σπίσσα* ; merito illud sigma haud temere irrepsisse videatur. Verius igitur, credo, reponas,

Λίνα δὲ σπείρα, κώμολίνου μακροὶ τόνοι.

Sect. 65. Antiphanis locus, καὶ τὸ *χερνίβιον* πρῶτον ἢ πομπή σαφές, ut *senarium* clare se ostendit fuisse, ita et sic esse corrigendum, *τὸ χερνίβιον* non *χερνίβιον*. Lego equidem totum ex Falkenb. *τὸ χερνίβιον* πρῶτον ἐκ πομπῆς ἄφες, vel ἀφείς. Sed, excepto *χερνίβιον*, nihil hic certum. Jam vero sect. 71. in Epicharmi senario ferri non potest *δηλοῖμην* ; requiritur vi metri vel *δηλοῖ μὲν*, vel *δηλοῖμεν*, vel fortasse,

Οὐτ' ἐν καθῶ δὴ λῶμεν, οὐτ' ἐν ἀμφορεῖ.

λῶμεν, *volumus*, ut *λῆς*, *υῖς*, *λῶντι*, *υὼμεν*, *Δωρικῶς*. Sect. 73. sic constitue locum Antiphanis :

— *ἀσκοπότην τινά*

Δίφους ἀρωγόν —

Sect. 74. Aristophanes ἐν δὲ τῷ *Γῆρα*, *Ἐφ' ὕδριαν δαίειζεν πεντέχουν ἢ μείζονα*. Atqui *senarius* haud recte procedit : quod ut fiat, lege minima imitatione, *Ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἰῆρα ἱφῆ*,

Ἰδρίαν δαίειζεν πεντέχουν ἢ μείζονα.

plane, ut *ἱφῆ* Sect. 76. *Κρατίνος ἐν Ὀραις*, *Ἐφ' ἡμῶν*, pro *ἐν Ὀραις ἱφῆ*, *Μῶν δὲ*. Ceterum corruptior est Polyzeli locus sect. 76. sed metri vestigia insistens sic veram lectionem eruo :

—λεκανίῳ γ' ἄρα

Πρῶτον μὲν ἀπονίψῃς, ἔπειτ' ἐνεξεμεῖς,
'Ενεκπλυνεῖς, ἐναποπατήσεις, Φανία.

Primum, ait, in λεκανίῳ lavabis adhuc puro; postea ad spurciora eu abuteris. Vide autem, ut una cum metro sententia quoque belle procedat. Quis neget, ἔπειτα necessarium esse post πρῶτον? quis in ἐναποβασεῖς, quod nihil est, non agnoscit τὸ ἐναποπατήσεις? Denique pro Καναῖα nomine inaudito, ecce tibi de machina trisyllabon Φανίας, Persona apud Menandrum et alios comicos notissima. Ceterum nota illud, ἐνεξεμεῖς, quod futurum notat Ἀττικῶς, ut plura alia tibi sine dubio non incognita. At sequitur deploratus plane locus Aristophanis, Καὶ ἡμῶσκάφης ὃ' ὡς ἐν τι εἰποδὶλονιῶν ἐμυομεν' ex quibus depravatissimis, tu nobis, amice, horribilem versum effinxisti, plane ἀμετρον et ἄμουνσον. At dehinc, σῆμε αὖδῃς, et artem metricam assequeris, id saltem discēs quod quantavis est pretii, tacere potius, quam nihil dicere. Ego vero ex prima facie catalecticum tetrametrum hic agnosco; ut proinde aut talis versus hinc excudendus sit, aut omnis opera ludatur. Vis ergo, ut hariolari incipiam? age, aut veram lectionem tibi dabo, aut saltem Aristophane non indignam; lege igitur,

Κάμῃν σκάφην δὸς, ὥστε μὴ' ὅς ποδάνιπτρον ἐξεμῶμεν,

Et nobis scapham da, ne evomamus in aquam qua pedes abluendi sunt.

Possit et sic, Κάμῃν σκάφης δὲ, μήποτ' ἐς &c.

Sed hoc, ut dixi, est hariolari: nam et animadverto te aliter paullo in Editione, aliter in Epistola ad me scripta, codicis verba exhibere. Si ipsa Excerpta Falkenburgiana viderem, certius fortasse aliquid extunderem. Sect. 78. in Dioclis senario nescivit bonus Kuhnus ποδάνιπτῆς secundam syllabam corripere; lege autem;

Τόρμα τις, ἢ χαλκοῦς ποδάνιπτηρ, ἢ λέβης.

Quin et Jungermannus (etsi altero, ut dixi, longe melior) sect. 79. in Pherecratis loco senarium inchoat ab Εἰσέκρουσεν; plane contra artem. Tu vero Tetrametrum puta, et sic constitue,

Αββοῦσα μὲν τῆς χυλνίκος, τὸν πύνδακ' εἰσέκρουσεν.

Sect. 82. in Cratini loco, nollem cæcum ducem secutus esses Kuhnium, in κατ' ἀλφῖτα. Quam otiosum enim ibi τὸ αἶτα? quam necessarius articulus τὰ ἀλφῖτα, ut ὁ βοῦς, ἢ μαγίς? Ergo sanctissima est vetus lectio:

'Ο βοῦς ἐκεῖνος, χ' ἢ μαγίς, καὶ τὰ λφῖτα.

Porro Phrynichi locus sect. 86. Κἄν δὲυβάφω &c. est Anapaesticus Aristophaneus; sed deficit uno pede anapaesto:

Κἄν δὲυβάφω χεῖρῃσθαι—τρῖς χυλνίκας ἢ, ὃῦ ἀλύραν.

neque vero sine Codice suppleri debet ex conjectura, lege insuper paullo ante, ἐν Ὁρμισιγ' Ἀριστοφάνους, non νης; ut hic ἐν ταῖς Φρυνίχου Μούσαις. Eodem versu genere habetur Metagenis locus sect. 88. sic collocandus:

-ως ἂν

Πολλαῖσι παραφίσι καὶ καιναῖς εὐωχῆσω τὸ θέατρον.
ut et alter iste ex Aristophanis Tagenistis,

Τὸ δ' ἔτνους ἐν ταῖς κυλίχλαις τουτὶ θερμὸν, καὶ τοῦτο παρλάζην.

Metrum ipsum efflagitat ἔτνους et τοῦτο, non ἔτνος et τουτὶ quod ultimam producit. Eleganter vero ἔτνους casu genitivo. ἔτνους τουτὶ καὶ τοῦτο. *Pultis pars calida, pars bulliens.* Sect. 90. in Cratetis loco, nollem te a scriptura Codicis discessisse,

Ὁ κἀνὴς δὲ τῆς κοίτης ὑπερέχειν μοι δοκεῖ.

Nam τὰ κανίσκια δὲ &c. quod tu dedisti, peccat in leges metri. Totus locus sic videtur legendus; Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις καὶ κανᾶ καὶ κἀνήτα καὶ κανίσκια. Καὶ κἀνὴς μὲν Κράτης ἐν Ἡρῳσιν εἶπεν, Ὁ κἀνὴς δὲ τῆς κοίτης ὑπερέχειν μοι δοκεῖ (ubi κἀνὴς videtur esse *storea, teges*) κἀνήτης vero Aristoph. Acharn. κανισκίῳ in Gerytade. vel forte κανίσκια rejiciendum, et κανίτια recipiendum ex VI. 86. Sect. 91. Eupolidis versus Trochaicus est, sic describendus:

Ἄλλὰ τὰς κοίτας γ' ἔχουσι πλουσίας σισαγμένης.

Sed Pherecratis locum tangere non ausim, adeo deformis est; si modo recte illum ex MS. exscripsi. Ἄλλὰ καὶ κοίτας τὰς ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀποβάνθ' ἃ μέλλομεν ἀριστήσιν. Sed ex fine tamen subodoror esse Aristophanicum σπονδαῖζοιτα. Tentemus igitur ad illud metrum redigere, Ἄλλ' ἐν κοίταις ἐνὶ γ', οὗτ' ἀπόβληθ', ἃ ἕλλομεν ἀριστήσιν. Sed in arcis insunt, non spernenda quidem, quæ eramus pransuri. Ἐνὶ id est ἐνέστι ἃ ἐμέλλομεν contracte ἃ μ. ut syllaba fiat longa, quam versus exigit. Sect. 93. Nicocharis verba duos senarios efficere pronunciat Kuhnius, qui ex numero syllabarum, non quantitate, senarios metiri videtur: melius paullo Jungermannus. Tu sic lege:

Σόφαις τε (vel Σοφαῖσι παλ.) παλάμαις τεπτόνων εἰσγασμένων

Καὶ πόλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ λέπτ' ἔχων καδίσκια, Κυμινδόκι—

vel etiam τέκτονος ἀπειργασμένον. Sect. 94. in Anaxippi loco apage illud στάθῃ, quod versus respuit. lege, Τὴν μυσσοβὴν λαβὼν παράστῃθ' ἐνθάδε. et ibidem Aristophanis locum sic dederat Pollux,

Φερε τοὺς ὀρελίσκους ἢ ἀναπήξω τὰς κίχλας.

Varia lectio ἀναπήξω, ἀναπείρω atque hæc melior. Sect. 98. in Teleclidis loco emendatio tua σίζοντα melius se tutabitur, si sic legeris:

Τὰ δὲ τήγανω σίζοντα σοὶ μολύνεται.

quod sine dubio verum. Quot enim τήγανω una εἴδον? adde quod τήγανον non potest μολύνεσθαι, corrumpi, dum σίζει; sed postquam destitit σίζειν humore consumpto, tum corrumpitur, nisi ocus de foco tollitur. Denique ὅσα ἐν τήγανω σίζουσιν, οὐκ αὐτὸ τὸ τήγανον. Aristophanes quidem loco a te laudato τήγανον τευβίδων σίκον dixit συναδοχικῶς sed simpliciter τήγανον σίκον sine ἡδὲ τευβίδων vix, opinor, dixisset. Sect. 101. locus Pherecratis sic locandus et corrigendus

— πῶς ἂν οὖν κομίσειέ μοι

Τίς θυμαλώπων ὧδε μεστήν ἐσχάραν;

Sect. 102. Menandri locum sic scribe:

— ἡγεῖται μ' ὄλωρ

Ἐπικόπανόν τι —

Me quidem plane mensam coquinariam quandam existimat.

(adeo me verberibus concidit) Sect. 103. Solonis jambum dolet mihi a te jugulatum esse, cum tuo πευσίδι. Quid nonne ex illis οἱ μὲν satis constat, nullum *vaz* antevisse: οἱ μὲν enim semper inchoat: sed ipse versus illud tuum furcilla expellit. Scribendum, aut σπεύδουσι δ', aut διδούσι δ', aut simile quid trisyllabon. Sect. 105. locus Cratini, Ἐπέδωκεν βαλάνων ἄβακα τῶν ἐκ φιττέως, ubi Kuhniius corrigit Πιτθέως, scil. ex domo Pitthei. Frustra; quasi Pittheus Thesei avunculus in vivis esset ætate Cratini; Ceterum quis non videt locum quendam, ubi βάλανοι nascuntur, non hominem designari? Equidem sic légerim,

Ἐπέδωκε βαλάνων ἄβακα τῶν ἐκ Φελλέως.

Φελλεύς locus Attice notissimus, de quo vide Stephanum Byzantium, Suidam, alios. Aristophanes in Nubibus, Ὅταν μὲν οὖν τὰς αἴγας ἐκ τοῦ Φελλέως. et in Acharn. Τὴν Στρυμονώρου Θραῦτταν ἐκ τοῦ Φελλέως. Vide ibi σχολ. Sect. 107. in loco Eubuli, pro Σικελικά, quod ἄμετρον est, lege,

Καὶ πνικτὰ Σικελὰ πατανίων σωρεύματα.

et ibidem Antiphanis, tam hic, quam apud Athenæum, lege,

— τρυλύνεις τετμημένους; non πολύνεις.

Sect. 110. locus Sophoclis mendosus est; qui hinc et ex VII. 109. sic corrigendus:

— συνέλεγον τὰ ξύλ', ὥς ἐκκαυμάτων

Μή μοι μεταξὺ προσδεεῖς εἶεν —

ligna, ait, collegerunt; ne interea carerent fomite ad ignem servandam. Sect. 111. Euripidis versus Trochaicus est; nisi quod οἷσιν e loco suo ejectionem sit: lege, Τοὺς ὄρους τοὺς λαγκαγωχοὺς ἐξ ὄρους οἷσιν ξύλα &c. vel forte, ut sententia continuetur, λαγκαγωχοὺς, οἷσιν ἐξ ὄρους ξύλα &c.

Sect. 116. Aristophanis locus sic distinguendus,

Καὶ διαστίλβονθ' ὀρώμεν

Ὅσπερ ἐν κρινῶ λυχνούχῳ

Πάντα τῆς ἐξωμίδος.

Plura hujus generis extant apud Aristophanem. Sect. 124. Theopompi locus sic locandus,

— χλαῖναν δέ σοι

Λαβὼν παχύναν ἐπιβαλὼ Λακωνικήν.

Ibid. locus Sapphus egregius, frustra a magnis viris tentatus; quem nisi Prosodiz ductu nemo recte expediverit: Ἐλδόν' ἐξ ὀραῶν πορφυρέαν ἔχοντα προιεμένον χλαῖναν. Ego vero, quatuor primis voca-

bulis vix perlectis, statim odoratus sum, carmen esse Alcaicum, quale hoc Horatii;

Nullam | Vare sacra | vile prius | severis | arborem : et illud Alcei,

Μηδὲν | ἄλλο φυτεύ | σης πρότερον | δένδρεον | ἀμπέλων.

et aliquot Sapphus, ut quod extat apud Athenæum p. 564. ubi ὄσσοις male pro ὄσσι,

Στάθι | κᾶντι φίλος | καὶ τὰν ἐπ' ὄσ' | ἀμπέτα | σὺν χάριν,
et apud Stobæum, *Κατὰ | νοῖσα δὲ κείσ' | οὐδεπόκα | μναμοσύ | να σέθεν,* et quæ ibi sequuntur. Ergo certus conjecturæ sic extemplo hunc locum refingebam;

Ἐλθόντ' | ἐξ ὀρανῶ | πορφυρέαν | περρέμε | νον χλάμυν.

Venientem de cælo, purpurea chlamyde amictum. Nam pro προιέμενον quod et versus et sententia refugit, repono περρέμενον *Æolice* pro περιέμενον sic apud Hesychium, *Περρέθηκατο, περιεθήκατο,* et alia alibi plura. Quis vero tam cæcus, ut jam non videat τὸ ἔχοντα ex margine fluxisse, interpretamentum scil. τοῦ περρέμενον.

Verba Diphili sect. 137. sic ordinanda sunt :

A. ——— ὁ δὲ κανδύταλις

Οὗτος τί δύναται, καὶ τί ἔστιν ; B. ὥσπερ ἂν

Εἵποις ἀορτάς——

Dux personæ, quarum altera quærit, quid significet κανδύταλις ; altera explicat per ἀορτάς. Multa similia hujus Diphili extant apud Athenæum : videtur fuisse φορτικὸς in verborum exoticorum affectatione. Sect. 139. Posidippi locum ita digere :

—— σκήνας, ὄχρους,

Ῥίσκους, ἀορτάς, τάχα δὲ, λαμπήνας, ὄνους.

nam τάχανα nihil est ; neque melius quid nunc succurrit.

Sect. 141. Nicochares in Cretensibus : καὶ ὅπας καὶ ὀπήτιον εἴρηται ἐν Νικοχάρους Κρησὶ, τοῖς τρυπάνοις ἀντίπαλον ὥσπερ Ἀρχιλόχειον. Ita tu, mi amice, locum depravatam ulterius contaminasti : *ὥσπερ* enim dedisti pro ὥπερ Seberi : atqui illud mendum erat typothetarum : voluit enim Seberus quod et Aldus et MSti habent ὅπερ. Deinde pro Ἀρχιλόχειον, Codices ἀρχίλιον. Ex hoc monstro, re metrica et ingenio fretus, sic tibi senarium restituo verum et genuinum,

Τοῖς τρυπάνοις ἀντίπαλον ὅπας χίλιον.

Quippe in hoc versu aut ὀπήτιον aut ὅπας inesse debere res ipsa clamat : aliquid prius a versu rejicitur, posterius latuit in ὅπεραν. Ergo in reliquis ne litera quidem mutata, et versus et sententia constat. *Ὅπας χίλιον* idem est ac ὀπέατα χίλια ; ut ἵππος χιλίη, μυρίη, et quæ acio tibi nota esse. Verte autem *Mille tubula quæ terebris paria facere possint.* Videtur fuisse dialogus fabri cum cerdone ; illi minabatur se τοῖς τρυπάνοις factum esse uescio quid : hic regere-

bat, se mille ὀπέατα adlaturum, quæ illius τρυπάνοις pares esse facile possent. Sect. 142. Platonis versus sic digere et scribe,

—βούλει τήνδε σοι πλεκτὴν καθῶ,

Κἀπειτ' ἀνελεύσω σε δεῦρο—

Sect. 143. Menandri versus Trochaicus est, "Ὡς ἔγωγ' ἀντιλόμην που σαυνίῳ πεπληγμένον.

Jam vero insignem Euripidis locum sect. 145. sanum, ni fallor, tibi exhibebo :

—πᾶς δὲ φασγάνῳ?

Ἐξήλθειεν ὥστε πύρινον στάχυν,

Σπαθὴ κολούων φασγάνου μελανόετου.

Nihil hic muto, nisi quod στάχυν addiderim, absorptum scilicet a sequente voce σπάθῃ. Sententiam recte cepit Jungermannus. πύρινος στάχυς, *spica triticea*, ἐξαθερίζω hic est ἀθίρας, *aristas*, detruncō, decutio. Quid clarius certiusve?

Sect. 150. Epistola ad Platonem in mendo cubat: Οἱ περὶ Ἑρασ-
τον καὶ Κόρισκον Πλάτανι ἐπιστέλλοντες γράφουσι. Ἀγνὸν Ἀσσίαν τῆς
Σαρκοφάγου λίθου. Ὁ δὲ φερεκράτης. Verba illa, Ἀγν. Ἀσ. τ. Σαρ.
λ. sunt ex Epistola; reliqua sunt Pollucis. Dixerat ille inter σορο-
ποιῶν instrumenta esse et ληνὸν probat jam hujus Epistolæ auctori-
tate. Quippe qui ληνὸν Ἀσσίαν nominaverant, de eadem re postea
ibi narrantes σάρον appellant. Ergo eadem ληνὸς quæ σορός. Cete-
rum: ἐπάγει et ἐπάγουσι sæpe hoc sensu veniunt apud nostrum; vide
modo sect. 10. 41. 127. Porro in sequente Pherecratis loco sect.
150. ita ordinandi sunt versus et Personæ:

Ἢ μὴ οὐ σαυτὸν μακαριῖς, ὦ τάν, ὅταν
Αὐτοῖ σε κατέρύττωτιν. Β. οὐ ὅτ', ἀλλ' ἐγὼ
Τούτους πρότερον οὗτοι δὲ μακαριούσι σφε.
Καὶ τοι πόθεν ληνούς τοσαύτας λήψομαι;

A. Certe te beatum ipse dices, o amice, cum illi te sepeliant. B.
non quidem, verum ipse eos prius sepeliam; et illi se beatos prædi-
cabunt: Unde tamen tot oculos eis sepeliendis comparabo? Ὡ τάν
autem addidi, flagitante versu; quod absorptum est a verbo se-
quente, μακαριούσι σφε, *beabunt se ipsi*. Cur autem aut hic aut
illi μακαριούσι se, cum sepeliuntur? nempe ob funus egregie fac-
tum, et sepulcrum magno sumtu extructum. Loquitur autem
aliquis, qui multos cognatos habuerit, bonis ejus inhiantes, et
mortem ejus expectantes: quos ille se occupaturum minatur, et
fore illis superstitem. Immo vero, jam melius quid habeo, quod
sub calamo modo nascitur. Deleas velim illud σφε, et cum vul-
gatis legas, οὗτοι δὲ μακαριούσ' ἐμὲ. Sententia autem hæc videtur.
Cum laudasset ille, nescio quis fortunas suas, tum ob alia,
tum ob firmam, credo, valetudinem, etsi strenue nepotaretur;
Hunc alter excipiens, Ita vero, ait εἰρωνικῶς, tum fortunas tuas
laudabis, cum cognati tui te mox sepelient. Non, non, subjungit

ille, Equidem eos omnes componam, et μακαριοῦσί με superstitem et sanum. Sect. 151. locum ex Tagenistis sic colloca;

— ὁ δὲ λύων κύστιν ὕειν

Καὶ τ' ἐξαιρῶν τοὺς βαρικοῖς. —

Sunt membra vitæ Anapæstici, Aristophanei dicti. Cum Kuhnii versiculum hic lego, vix possum nausea compescere. Neque eo melior est Jungermanni jambus sect. 154. in Lysippi Bacchis. Tu vero locum sic constitue, ut membrum sit Anapæstici Aristophanei,

— αὐτοῖς αὐλοῖς ὀρυῖ καὶ γλωττοκομείῳ.

Tibicen, inquit, *inruit una cum tibiis et glottocomio*. Αὐτοῖς eo sensu passim apud Atticos occurrit, pro σὺν αὐτοῖς; quod tu optime nosti. Ibid. Metri ratio satis indicat, tam in Timoclis loco, quam Apollodori γλωττόκομον legendum esse, non γλωττοκομειον. Lege itaque, οὐ μὲν ἄλλα καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου γλωττόκομον, &c. et deinde membrum pone senarii—καὶ τὸ γλωττόκομον βαλαινέται. Porro sect. 160. sanus erat Sophoclis locus, neque sollicitandus,

Κέστρε σιδήρα πλευρά καὶ κατὰ ῥάχιν

Ἰλκουν· παίων —

Agitabat præ se hominem, verberans super latera et dorsum κέστρε, ferica. Eleganter illud πλευρά καὶ κατὰ ῥάχιν, hoc est, κατὰ πλευρά καὶ ῥάχιν; quale illud Anacreontis, *Ἢ Νῆλιν ἢ πὶ Μέμφιν. Ceterum κατὰ hic ultimam producit ob τὸ εἰ sequens.

Sect. 162. Dolet, te repulisse emendationem certissimam,

καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἔχον μὲν κυρβάσιαν ἐρεῖ.

Pileum autem dices me instar tiaræ habere; adeo magnificus est scilicet. Quid aptius vel desiderari possit? et illud tuum κοινὴν quorsum spectat? *dices me habere communem tiaram*: nimirum, non esse regem. Τίς ὁ νόμος; dubiumne id esse potuit? Sed ex metro solo utique constat, legendum esse κοινὴν· cuius argumenti vim et πιθανάγκην soli artis periti possunt agnoscere. Sect. 174. locus Teleclidæ

Δουλοπόνηρον ῥυπαρὸν σκέλυθρον.

est Anapæsticus, et bene habet. Mox sect. 165. legendum,

Στάλμν γὰρ ὄρχεις βασιλῆς ἐκτ' ἡμῶν ἐμούς.

στάλμν βασιλῆς, *cultor regis*. Βασιλῆς adjective hic ponitur, ut alia similia passim. Eunuchus autem loquitur hoc, significans, se jussu regis castratum esse, ut a cubiculo esset vel ei vel uxori: solæ enim, ut ille ait, Eunuchis utebantur reginæ. Citius autem cælum ipsum dirueris, quam illud βασιλεύς, cui tu patrocinaris, invito metro hic possit consistere; ut de sententia ipsa et constructione nihil dicam. Illud quoque corrigendum ibidem in Hermipii loco, ἀσπιδεῖν, non ἀσπιδιον,

*Ἐχ ντες ἰσον ἀσπιδεῖον ὀγκίῳ. est enim senarius.

Sectione autem 167. in Philippidæ loco, vel cum Salmasio legendum,

Ἄλυσιον εἶχε τέτταρας δραχμὰς ἄγον,
quod verum puto, vel, si illud quovis pacto retinere vis, lege,
Ἄλυσιον εἶχε τέτταράκοντ' ἄγον δραχμὰς.

Sect. 176. Ὀλκείον rectum esse, non ὀλκίον, Menandri locus ostendit, sic digerendus;

— ἢ χαλκοῦν μέγα Ὀλκείον —
et alter Philemonis, Ὀλκείον εἶδον ἐπὶ τραπέζῃ κείμενον,
• Πυρῶν τε μεττόν —

Vapulet vero Kuhnii cum versiculis suis, quibus nec caput, nec pes adest. Sect. 180, locus Aristophanis duos continet Anapaesticos cum Paroemiaco eos claudente; ut fieri solet tum apud illum scriptorem, tum omnes Tragicos,

Καὶ τοὺς μὲν οφείεις, οὓς ἐπιπέμπεις,
Ἐν κίστῃ που κατασήμεναι
Καὶ παῦσαι φαρμακοπωλῶν.

Porro Cappanei hæc verba esse conjicio, qui in Dramate hoc Satyrico Amphiaræum augurem ludificatur. Sect. 181. Theopompicum sic constitue, ex lege metri, ut antea l. vii.

Τῇ οὐ περιζωσάμενος ὡς λουτρίδα,
Κατάδεσμον ἤβης περιπέτασιν —
et mox ibidem Pherecratis locum sic emenda,

Ἦδὲ μὲν ὡς λουμένω προζώννυτε.

Scis sine dubio, αἰ et ε in libris scriptis passim inter se permu-
tari. Jam, ait, vos illi lavanti pellem circumligate. Sectione au-
tem 185. quicquid obtendant Pollucis tui codices, uti et Suidæ
et Harpocratonis, legendum credo πλίνθιον, non πλινθεῖον, ex frag-
mento illo Aristophanis, quod membrum est Tetrametri Catalec-
tici,

— ὅ δ' ἐς τὸ πλίνθιον γενόμενος ἐξέτρεβε —

Ille vero, ubi venerat ad locum quo lateres fiebant, divertebat.

Quippe apud Atticos loca rerum venalium et res ipsæ venales
eodem nomine signabantur, ipso Polluce indicante lib. ix. et x.
Sic dicebant, ἐς τοῦψον, ἐς τὰ μύρα, ἐς τὸν χλωρὸν τύρον, ἐς τὰ ἀνδρά-
πυδα, ἐς τὸν οἶνον, ἐς τοῦλαιον, ἐς τὰς χύτρας, ἐς τὸν λιθναυτὸν, &c.
Ergo ἐς τὸ πλίνθιον eodem modo, ad locum ubi πλίνθιον fiebat, vel
venibat. Nisi forte ἐς τὰ πλίνθια potius dicendum fuisse contendat
aliquis. Ille vero sic locum constituat, eodem versus genere,

Ὅ δ' ἐς τὸ πλινθεῖον γενόμενος ἐξέτρεβε —

Sect. 188. Recte habet codex Vossianus τὴν γοῦν in Aristopha-
nis loco, qui sic digerendus:

— τὴν γοῦν ἀσπίδα,
Ἐπίθημα τῷ φρέατι παράθες εὐθὺς.
τὰ φρέατι secundam producit.

Sect. 189. Legere possis, μὴ λίγδος καλεῖται, nunquid vocatur
λίγδος; videtur enim dubitare; unde addit, ὅθεν καὶ Σαρακλῆς εἶπε;
cujus locus sic videtur legendus,

Ἀσπίς μὲν, ἡ μοι, λίγδος ὥς, πυκνοματεῖ.

Sane mirifice arridet Kuhnii illa correctio πυκνομαματεῖ. Πιατεῖ quid hic faciat, non intelligo. Sect. 190. Platonis Comici locum sic divide,

— δότω δὲ τὴν κιθάραν τις ἐνδοῖθεν

Καὶ τοῦπιπόρπαμ' —

Ibid. Anaxilæ locus sic legendus, Οὐκ ἂν γε μὴ τοῦτ' ᾔνεθαι κ-ράμινον. Denique loco ultimo sect. 192. pro inficetis illis senariis Kuhnii, quos Eupolide de suo donat, hos ille habeat aliquanto meliores,

— καθόσω δύο,

Κρατῆρας ὀκτώ, δύο χύτρα, δύο τρυβλία,

Ἐνέφαλα τε καὶ (vel Κνεφαλα τρία) θερμανστριν,

ἐξ ὁρόνους,

Κλίνας ἑκατόν, κέρημα, κιβατὸν, λύχνον.

Pro χύτραν versu tertio, quod jam præcesserat, neque repeti debuit, repones σκάφην, vel λύραν, vel simile quid, quod propius accedat. Nobis ad indagandum fugitivum illud nunc non est otium. Defessus enim sum tædio scribendi; quod longe majore opera mihi constitit, quam emendationes ipsæ. Tu vero, doctissime et amicissime Hemsterhusi, si quid hinc frugis colligere possis ad curas tuas secundas, quas in Polluce te positurum narras, utere, fruiere, jure tuo et arbitrato. Ubi id tempus venerit, videbimus forte, an in ceteris hujus libris aliquid nobis occurrat, quod doctissimos editores fugerit. Etsi, ut verum fatear, rationem consilii tui nondum perspicio. Quis enim typographus librum denuo recudet, mole sua et pretio laborantem? Ecquando omnia nuperæ Editionis exemplaria dividentur? Tu igitur certiores nos facies, quo pacto et quo instituto iterum, ut narras, auctorem hunc aggredi velis. Vale, vir eruditissime, et me, quod facis, amare perge. Cantabrigiæ, ix. diē Junii, MDCCVIII.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. VIII.

Explicit. This word, generally used at the end of MSS. and early printed books, is a contraction of *explicitus*. The ancient books were rolls of parchment, (hence the Latin word *volumen*, and our *volume*) which were unfolded by the reader in his progress through them. When they were quite *unfolded*, they were of course *finished*; and the word *explicitus*, which properly conveyed the former sense, was afterwards used in the latter, when the books assumed a different form, to signify that they were *finished*.

A. L.

Points.—Fabretti, in his collection of ancient Inscriptions, published at Rome in 1699, observes that “the ancients placed Points at the end of every word, but scarcely ever at the end of a line, though sometimes after every syllable.”—This is exemplified in AD. FINIBUS. OB. VENERIT. DUM. TAKAT. This singular mode was used in the third century.

It has been said that these Points were placed in Epitaphs, in order to excite sympathy and grief in the mind of the reader by these frequent pauses. But we find in Lupi (*Epitaphium Severa*) the following Inscription, which is full of Points, without any sentiment of pity or sorrow :

IMP. CAES. M. AN. TO. NI. O.
COR. DI. A. NO. PI. O. PE. LI. CI.
AVG. P. M. TRIB. POT. II. COS. PP.
COR. NE. LI. A. PRE. TEX. TA. TA.
IVI. NAM. PI. E. TA. TEM. E. IVS.
QVE. SVOS. ET
DI. CI. VM.
EN. TI. AM. SV. AM.
BA. VIT.

The title DAN is derived from *Dominus* ; which in the monkish ages was written *Domnus*, and afterwards abbreviated by the French into *Dom*, by the Spaniards into *Don*, and by the English into *Dan*. A. L.

None of the commentators on Shakespeare, or general critics, have noticed a line in Hamlet, the harsh, difficult sound of which admirably expresses the sense :

And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain.

Vaugelas took such infinite pains with his translation of Quintus Curtius, and delayed the publication of it so long by his frequent corrections, that Voiture told him that before his work was complete, the French language would have undergone changes, which would oblige him to recompose it. By the substitution of *lingua* to *barba*, he applied to him the verses of Martial :

Eutrapelus tonsor, dum circuit ora Luperci,
Expungitque genas, altera barba subit.

The translation at last appeared, and no higher character can be given of it than the expression of Balzac, that the Alexander of Quintus Curtius was invincible, and that of Vaugelas inimitable.

AFRICAN LANGUAGES.

(From *Campbell's Travels in South Africa*.)I.—*The Lord's Prayer in the Hottentot Language.*

Cita üp ne nanooop na, sa ons anoohe, sa koop
Our Father the Heaven in thy name hallowed be thy kingdom,
 ha, sa ei i hoop ei ne nanooop na koommi, cita
come thy will be done earth on the Heaven in as our
 cecorobe berip mata neci, i cita sobrootikoo oobekata
daily bread give us this day and our debts forgive us
 cita soorooti aukoo citce oobeka koommi, i ta oowa
our indebted men we forgive as and not temptation
 keikata, gawe coreta eip ga; o sa ne koop ke, i
lead us but deliver us evil from for thine the kingdom is and
 de keip, i de isa i amo.
the power and the glory in eternity.

II.—*In the Language of Madagascar.*

Rait-sica an-danghitsi, angare ano ho fissa tife i fansap ano
Father our in Heaven name thy magnified be, kingdom thy
 evi aminaie; amorompo-ano ho efa iz an tanne oucoua
come to us the pleasure of thy heart be done in earth as if
 an-danghitsi. Mahoume anaie ananenai anrouanne moufe
in Heaven give to us for our support day this bread
 abi. Tane i ou zahaie, o Zanhar, gui fannahenaie ratsi abi; toua
all remit to us o God trespasses our evil all as
 zaie mivale i fanuahe ratsi a gni rati naie; aca manatitse anaie
we forgive iniquities enemies to our do not lead us in
 vetse-vetse ratsi; fea ano millenesa anaie tabin ratsi abi.
conceptions evil but thou deliver us from evil all.

Numbers in Madagascar.

Rec, one. Roue, two. Telou, three. Effat, four. Dimi, five.
 Henne, six. Fitou, seven. Valou, eight. Civi, nine. Polou, ten.
 Zatou, hundred. Arrive, thousand.

Velius Longus informs us that it was not unusual to write *kis*, *kæ*, *kid*, for *quis*, *quæ*, *quid*. In some French editions of the beginning of the 16th century we find *kiskis*, *kankan*, for *quisquis*, *quumquam*. Nicéron relates that a clergynian was deprived of his benefice for his presumption in pronouncing *quamquam* instead of *kankan*. The offender had the fortitude to appeal to the parliament of the province, who decreed "that he might use his discretion in his pronunciation."

Votum JOANNIS COTTONI pro nepote suo carissimo
R. COTTONO, 1692.

Cresce, puer, tecum et repetens exempla tuorum,
Exsupera morum nobilitate genus.
Artibus ingenuis cultus sis, quicquid Athenæ,
Et quicquid nobis Roma diserta dedit.
Sisque, precor, magne subnixus robore mentis,
Et non fucata simplicitate bonus
Virtutis fidus sis custos, cultor honesti;
Et veræ semper Religionis amans.
Mollia tranquillæ currant tibi tempora vitæ,
Et veniat tardo cana senecta pede!

A. L.

SACRED DRAMAS.—The following title of the *Mystery of the Acts of the Apostles* is a curious specimen of the taste and language of the time:—"Les Catholiques Œuvres & Actes des Apostres, rédigez en escript par Saint Luc Évangéliste, & Historiographe, icellui S. Luc escrivant à Théophile, avec plusieurs histoires en icellui inscrites des gestes des Césars. Le tout ven & corrigé bien & duement selon la vraie vérité, & joué par personnages à Paris en l'hostel de Flandres, l'an mil cinq cents quarante ung. Avec privilège du Roy."

"The *Antiquarius*, by the ancients called *Librarius*, wrote after another person, called the *Dictator*, who held the original and dictated. As the Greek pronunciation differs from ours, if the Dictator says τῖς, τῆς, ταῖς, or τοῖς, the Antiquarius, who perhaps did not regard the sense or connexion, wrote down TIC; for the Greeks pronounce all these words alike. In time the orthography changed in the Greek tongue, as it has done in others. The Greeks did not endeavour to reform their language to the pure Attic of Isocrates; but rather seemed in their MSS. to write many words, not as they were in the original, but according to the more modern fashion; as the Normanno-Saxons, in transcribing old copies, corrupted the orthography. To instance an old MS. I may cite the old fragments in the Greek Gospels in the Cotton Library, written in large ancient letters of silver and gold, which I take to be older than the Alexandrian MS. from the form of the letters. In these fragments are the same faults, as CHIPAN for σπείραν, KTPHNEON for Κυρηναῖον, EPXOME KAI ΠΑΡΑΛΗΜΨOME for ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι, EIMEI for εἰμὶ, MIZON for μίζαν, and many others." 1700. H. WANLEY.

A. L.

*Quid dedicatum possit Apollinem
Vates?* —————

Phœbe, fave; sanctas humili pede proterit aras
Advena, liminibus jam novus hospes adest.
Phœbe, fave; insanas vellem depellere curas,
Molliter et totos vivere posse dies.
A me livor edax, longèque inamabilis absit
Invidia, et, pectus qui premit, absit amor..
Absit amor, quem te, Daphnen per celsa sequentem
Culmina, telorum vi superâsse ferunt.
Victus eras. Puro nos et cedamus amor,
Huic me non pigeat succubuisse Deo.
Arma, in me verte arma; Deus, felicibus uror
Vulneribus, nunquam quis caruisse decet.
Heu!—perco! tantorum ubi erit medicina dolorum?
Nunc scio quid contra sit capere arma Deos.
Emorior, dum te video, mea Delia; dum te,
Delia, non video, non minus emorior.
Phœbe, meum vestro caruit medicamine vulnus,
Nunc, Deus, optatam nunc, rogo, confer opem.
Quæ voces animum flectent? quo carmine nymphæ
Insinuem tenero milia tela sinu?
Quid sit amor, novi; docuit me Delia amorem;
Hanc quoque crudelem fas didicisse Deum.
Si faveas votis, tibi tunc venerande, capella
Ante cadet sacras sanguinolenta fores.
Esto. Nunc mea sit conjux carissima, nec te,
Alme, piget precibus, Phœbe, favere meis.
Sit casa parva quidem, sed sit mihi lauta supellex,
Unde brevis mensæ detur habere dapes.
Non equidem optârim multos numerare sodales,
Neve mihi exiguos turba sit ante fores.
Adsit rara cohors, at, sit, (Deus, annue votis,)
Quisque mihi fidâ junctus amicitia.
Rura colam, sylvæque petens inglorius umbras
Te recinem densis, Phœbe, sub arboribus;
Sylvestresque humili modulatus arundine musas,
Dicam equidem quicquid dicere suadet amor.
Ah! talem in tuto liceat si ducere vitam,
Nestoris ut vellem vivere posse dies.
Non mihi fas vel erit tardam metuisse senectam,
Vel si aderit rapido mors properata pede.
Et, si mors aderit,—si te, mea Delia, linquam,
Saltem habeam moriens deficiente manu.
At quando hora venit, quâ tu “vale,” Delia, dices,
Hoc mihi restabit dicere, “vita, vale!”

IN ÆTERNUM HONOREM ROBERTI BURNS.

Poetarum Caledoniæ sui ævi longe principi,
Cujus carmina eximia, patrio sermone scripta,
Animi magis ardentis ingenique vi,
Quam arte vel cultu conspicua,
Facetiis, jucunditate, lepore, affluentia,
Omnibus literarum cultoribus satis nota;
Cives sui, necnon plerique omnes,
Musarum amantissimi, memoriamque viri
Arte poeticâ tam præclari, foventes
HOC MAUSOLEUM,
Super reliquias poetæ mortales,
Exstineudum curavere.
Primum hujus ædificii lapideum
Gulielmus Miles, Armiger,
Reipublicæ architectonicæ apud Scotos
In regione australi, Curio maximus Provincialis,
Georgio Tertio regnante,
Georgio, Walliæ Principe,
Summam imperii pro patre tenente,
Josepho Gass, armigero, Dumfrisiæ Præfecto,
Thoma J. Hunt, Londinensi, Architecto,
Posuit,
Nonis Juniis, Anno Lucis VMDCCCXV
Salutis Humanæ MDCCCXV.

G has often yielded its place to C: thus from כמל camelus has been formed; λέλεγται has become λέλειπται; μίσγω, misceo; γωρυτός, corytus; regtum, rectum,¹ &c. C is indeed the original character: G is called a new letter by Diomedes, and was unknown to the Romans before the first Punic war. According to Terentius Scaurus, it was introduced by Spurius Carvilius.

In our own times G has frequently given way to C. *Throgmorton* has been changed into *Throckmorton*, *Bugden* into *Burkden*; and will it not be said hereafter, that the *Isle of Dogs* should have been called the *Isle of Docks*?

Sometime after the return of Charles II. Dr. Isaac Barrow wrote the following distich:

Te magis optavit rediturum, Carole, nemo;
Et nemo sensit te rediisse minus.

¹ See Vossius, Etymologicon.

*Dialogue on the Installation of Pope Urbanus VIII. who has
bees in his coat of arms:*

Gall. Gallis mella dabunt, Hispanis spicula figent.

Hisp. Spicula si figent, emorientur Apes.

Ital. Mella dabunt cunctis, nulli sua spicula figent :
Spicula nam princeps figere nescit Apum.

ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΤΑΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ,
SIVE APOLOGIA ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ,
AUCTORE JOANNE JUELLO, OLIM EPISCOPO SARISBURIENSI,
GRÆCÆ QUIDEM REPERTA.
A JOANNE SMITH, A. B. Oxonii, 1639.

Nuper recensuit et notas addidit A. C. CAMPBELL, A. M.

PONTEFRACII EXCUDIT B. BOUTHROYD, apud quem veneunt. Veneunt etiam
LONDINI apud Rivington et EBORACI apud bibliopolas.

1812.

THE appearance from a country press of such a work as we here intend to notice would have deserved at any period the attention of the scholar. The original Latin *Apologia* was reprinted also in the same year at Pontefract; and an *English Translation illustrated with Historical Notes* came out from the same press in the year 1813—both of them, at this period, works well worthy the regard of the Theologian.

And yet we have little doubt that we are now making all the three for the first time known to the great body of our reader. We are desirous therefore to give such publicity to the whole, as may place them fairly before the eye of the learned world: an advantage hitherto lost, from the unostentatious nature of their appearance, and the retired modesty of the Editor and Translator.

Of the general merits of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* little need be said at this day. That is a point settled by the voice of ages. But what has long been displayed as panoply, may be worn again as armour. And the *Apology of Jewel*—in that view—bears too strongly upon the great Protestant controversy, to be talked of merely—and neglected—by the present generation of Divines.

For if the Romish Church in faith and in practice be indeed ever the same and know not even the shadow of turning; this master piece of animated and vigorous argument pleads for our continued separation from the Church of Rome, on the very same

ground of errors and abuses which justified our first departure from her pale.

On any other supposition, let us ask the most learned and liberal of that Communion for their own history of their own variations. And taking the state of the question from the *Apologia*, let them avow, what acts of personal and official misconduct in their Popes and Prelates there recited, they condemn or deny; and what corruptions in their discipline there attacked, they give up as indefensible. Finally, let them demonstrate, if they can, what points of their doctrine there exhibited, as gross and unscriptural, are now entertained by their people, in a sense less discrepant to the gospel and less abhorrent to rational belief.

But all this perhaps, in a *Classical Journal*, is so much digression. What we promised to our readers strictly, was a critical notice of Smith's Greek version, as a curiosity in literature. We proceed accordingly.

The two editions of the work were published at Oxford, yet even in that university, its birth place, copies of either, we believe, are now very scarce and very little known. The *third* edition (such only we suppose it to be,) lately edited by Mr. Campbell, is presented, by a very appropriate *dedication* written in Greek, to the Bishop of Durham; as having been undertaken at his kind suggestion and as being naturally connected with a name so distinguished for Protestant zeal.

Though somewhat out of order, we are inclined to quote the following sentence from that peculiarity of syntax in it called an Attic solécism; which, because from inadvertence some of the ancients might speak so now and then, the Sophists, to give a new turn and quaintness to their style, affected every where as a beauty.

συνελόντι ὃ εἶπεν, Εἴη δὲ Εἰ τὴν τοῦ Δημοσθένους σεμνότητα, ἢ τὸν τοῦ Κικέρωνος ὄγκον, ἢ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου σπουδὴν Αἰιητοῦν Εἰδοῦν ἂν εἰς τὸ μέσον φέρειν ταύτην τὴν τοῦ Ιουέλλου ἀπολογίαν.

Qu. Does the peculiarity remarked above admit of defence as correctly Attic? or must it be excused only as an Attic ἀνακόλουθον?

The *Preface*, also written in Greek, states, with courtesy and thanks, that Mr. Campbell was indebted to the biographer of Sir Philip Sidney and of Isaac Walton, "the pious and learned Dr. Zouch," for a copy of the *second* edition, from which his own was reprinted. We are told also, that Smith was one of the fellows of Magdalen; but from something singular in Mr. Campbell's phrase, it appears doubtful, whether he ever advanced beyond the degree of B. A. And Smith, perhaps, presents one more instance of the precarious vitality of great early talent.

¹ Bentley on Phalaris, pp. 319.

Mr. Campbell in his Preface to the Latin Apologia writes thus :

"The scarcity of this valuable book, besides its own merit, induced the Editor to revive it in such a form, as might render it accessible to youth. The addition of Smith's Greek Translation will certainly be deemed an improvement; as it has great merit, not only in point of language, but from making the sense of the original clearer."

Now though at this moment we are not prepared with facts exactly to illustrate Mr. C.'s last assertion in the paragraph just quoted; yet we cannot but echo his general compliment to the translator—τὰ τοῦ Ιουέλλου νοήματα οὐχ ὅτι τῇ λέξει τῇ σαφιστάτῃ ἀναπτύξας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ τῇ ῥητορικῇ λαμπρύναι.

And in the mean while to show how much the Greek language in point of precision surpasses all others with which it is usually compared; we refer our readers to the foot of the page.¹ The distinction there drawn with great acuteness and justice by the eminent prelate already mentioned, is so strikingly to the purpose that we could not pass it by.

With all our respect to Mr. C. for his zeal and ability as an

¹ I cannot help thinking that some misconception and perversion of the Scripture doctrine of salvation may have arisen from an ambiguity in the words "saved by faith without works," arising from the different meanings which may be annexed to them accordingly as they are spoken or written. If we could have been saved by our own good works, Christ would have died in vain. But, as we cannot be saved *by works*, God has mercifully appointed, that we shall be saved *by faith, without works*. But to be "saved by faith, without works," that is, per fidem, nullo operum adjumento, has a very different meaning from being saved *by faith without works*, that is, per fidem infructuosam.

In the first sense, *without works*, is the attribute of the verb; in the second, it is the attribute of the noun. The difference is still more striking in Greek. We are saved διὰ πίστεως, ἀνευ ἔργων, but not διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἀνευ ἔργων. For, we are saved by faith—without works; but not by *the* faith which is without works. The former sense, by admitting that we are saved not by works, (for our best works are far short of our duty,) but by an atonement of infinitely greater value, does not exclude the necessity of good works; but the latter supposes the validity of a faith unproductive of good works, a sense contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. To be saved, *without works* (that is, not by our own good works, but) *by faith*, is not subject to the same ambiguity as to be "saved *by faith without works*." Sermons, Charges, and Tracts, by Shute, Bishop of Durham. London, 1811. pp. 291, 5. Note.

Editor, we have to complain, however, that he has neglected one part of his duty. He ought to have entertained and instructed the purchasers of Smith's Greek version with Smith's own Epistle to President Langton (the Routh, we may well presume, of his day) dated Anno 1613. Julii 22, and with his Preface Lectori φιλέλλησι alike worthy of preservation. Without these two pieces, we must pronounce Mr. C.'s edition imperfect; and shall supply the defect, by reprinting them intire from the first edition in 1614. The second of 1639 is not at our command.

After he has gratified his curiosity by the perusal of the Epistle and the Preface, let the Greek Scholar take up the version itself with the Latin original before him. And we shall endeavour at an early day to meet him again with a few remarks on Smith's execution of the task; which it would be trespassing too far on the pages of this Journal to insert at present.

N* N** N***

ἈΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ἈΠΤΑΩΝ

Ἑλληνίστις Ἑλληνιστὶ μεταφρασθεῖσα.

APOLOGIA ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ GRÆCÆ VERSA.

Interprete I. S. Bacc. in Art.

Πρωτοπύριω συγγνώμη.

OXONIA,

Excudebat Josephus Barnesius. 1614.

CLARISSIMO, doctissimoque viro D. Doctori Langton, Collegii Magdalenensis Præsidi dignissimo.

Non equidem faciam (Ornatissime Præses) ut quando tibi scribo, Græcarum literarum cognitionem dilaudare videar. Est illa jam pervagata satis opinio, qui harum sit prorsus experts, doctum nequaquam esse perhibendum. Enimvero tantopere nostrum hoc seculum iis deditum esse videmus, ut quum apud prioris temporis homunciones proverbio increbuerit, *Græcum est, non potest legi*; contra nihil fere nunc legatur, præterquam aut ipsa Græcorum scripta, aut quod eorum oleat disciplinas. Neque vero præclarum id sibi ducunt homines nostri, si quomodocumque sic scripta intellegant: quin et ipsi quoque lascivientes (ut sit) ἐκ περιουσίας Græcè scripturiunt. Hinc pridem illæ non tam geminis distinctæ, quam geminae Budæi Epistolæ: quas elegantes profecto dicerem, nisi mæras judicassem elegantias. Hinc suum nobis peplum, opus pulchre Medius fidiis variegatum, proximis istis diebus misit Heinsius. Hinc etiam ante paucos annos Cottonus literas ad Camierum (priuriente mirum ni ambitione Jesuiticâ) Græcas dedit. Mitto Fulviam Olympiam Moratam, sexu femininam, ætate puellam,

genere nobilem, hac tamen palæstra vix ulli secundam. Vident scilicet quod res est : otiosam esse lectionem : doctrinæ iudicium e scriptis faciendum : juxta vetus hemistichium : ¹ ἔργα δὲ χεῖρας ἐλέγχει. Proinde quum nuper nescio quibus auspiciis ad hæc me studia serio applicuisssem, putavi non esse prius conquiescendum, quam illud essem assequutus, ut etiam Græco idiomate mentis meæ sensus utcunque profarer. Nam eorum sane haud probo institutum, qui seu laboris tadio, seu insitâ quadam animi levitate, seu ἀψυχροπιά² communi illo multorum adolescentium vitio laborantes, defunctorum huic linguæ navant operam, tantumque ponunt in eâ temporis, quantum satis fore credunt ad popularem ostentationem : solidam vero et accuratam cognitionem aiunt se minimo desiderare.

Illud porro exercitamenti genus omnium pariter honestissimum utilissimūque semper existinavi, quo sententiam alienam nostris verbis interpretamur, et quod prius Latinè dictum est, Græcum facimus. Alioqui sape contingit præ nimio vocularum aucupio rem ipsam negligi : cumque politè non possumus dicere, quæ cogitamus, ea cogitemus, quæ politè dicere valeamus.

Quippe cujuslibet est liberè vagari, suumque sequi impetum ; verum ad certos quasi modos incedere, et alterius tantum vestigiis inhærere, mirabor si quis unquam temere potuit. Unde, neminem videmus tam esse felici ingenio, quin operosius multo scribat propria, quàm intelligit aliena : vertatque aliena, quàm scribit propria. Interim quod a preceptoribus dicendi rectè observatum legimus,³ *difficiliora debent esse quæ exercent, quo sit levius illud, in quod exercent ; ut Athletæ ponderibus plumbeis assuefaciunt manus, quibus vacuis et nudis in certamine utendum est.* Hæc ubi satis comperissem, proximum fuit dispicere certum autorem : nullus autem prius occurrit hoc ipso, quem nunc præ manibus habes, *Juello*.

Audacter (inquis) factum. Itane oportuit ἐν πῖλῳ τὴν κεραμείαν. ⁴ Equidem non habeo (Vir Optime) quod respondeam. Liber enim iste quâ divinâ ipsius argumenti sublimitate, quâ profluenti dictionis ubertate, vel exercitatissimum quemque interpretem, Græcæque linguæ peritissimum torqueret : et vero Stephanus, Whitakerus, Sylburgius, doctissimi (probè constat) homines, non nisi minutos quosdam Catechismos aggrediebantur. Quid igitur ? Ego possum, illi non potuerunt : Nequaquam, ita me ament Musæ : sed ut uno verbo expediam, volui, quod Græcis in proverbio est,⁴

¹ Suidas in ἐλέγχω.

² Aristot. Rhe. 2. c. 1.

³ M. Fab. 11. cap. 2.

⁴ Eustat. in Iliad. A et P ubi etiam interpretatur ἐν φάει καὶ ὀλεσσειν.

ἐξ ἀξίου ξύλου καὶν ἀπάγξασθαι, ut si desperanda esset laus omnis, venia saltem foret paratior.

Atqui multo fortassis habitior, multoque venustior hæc mea prodisset interpretatio, si non quotidiana Græcorum authorum lectio, unde stilus et sanguinem et colorem trahit; partim afflictâ corporis valetudine, partim rusticâ peregrinatione, partim aliis importunis negotiis, nimis, heu nimis diu abrupta jacisset. Adde quod in eas redactus sum temporis angustias, ut sanctè affirmare possim, intra spatium unius sesquimensis totum opus mihi planè confectum. Quare tametsi cum¹ Lucullo non dicam, idcirco me barbara quidam et solæca dispersisse, quò faciliùs hæc meam probem esse translationem: vereor tamen ne qua minùs Attica, dum nimium festino, passim urepersint; adeoque authorem arguant vel imperitum, (qualem utique me lubeus profiteor) vel a tempore saltem imparatum. Cæterum imprimis hic tria videbis verborum monstra, quæ nec Athenis nata sunt, nec illud sapiunt cælum, videlicet Ἰουβιλαΐα, Βούλλας, Ἰνδουλογεῖταις. Hæc autem propterea sunt à me posita, quòd in amplissimis Græciæ latifundis,² nulla reperiebam vocabula, quibus isthæc singula propriè satis enuncientur. Neque mirum id cuiquam videri debet. Si enim eruditissima Græcorum natio non habeat (attestante M.³ Cicerone) quo ineptum exprimat; quid? has ineptiarum omnium ineptissimas, has adentias, hæc fanatica delirantium somnia, quo tandem nomine appellabit? Quinetiam illud scias velim, tanto pluris apud me fidelitatem esse, quam eloquentiam, ut religiosè caverim, necubi forte captandis phrasibus ab *Jueth* mente vel minimum disciderim. Itaque verisimile est nonnusquam Græcæ linguæ me vim intulisse, dum scilicet aciem animi aliorum intenderim. Verum ista quanquam defendere liceat⁴ exemplis haud vulgaribus; tamen humanitati tuæ condonanda potiùs relinquo. Non sum profectò, non sum adeò vecors, ut meorum quicquam hac præsertim ætate sine veniâ placere putem: nec ita tui oblitus, ut eam a te vel petere dubitem, vel impetrare desperem. Faxis igitur (Præses Integerrime) calidum hoc meum et planè juvenile incæptum, minimum *periculosæ plenum opus alex*, boni consulas; et interpretationem hanc, qualem qualem, certe quidem observantiæ tesseram, candide velis interpretari. Quod si propitium hic te fuero expertus, alia posthac, at alius ea quoque generis me spero allaturum:

¹ Tul. ad Atticum L. 1.

² Nam ἀφέσεως σημασίαι (quo utuntur oi OB Levit. 25.) haud scio, an Jubilæis Papisticis ita quadraret.

³ 2 De Oratore.

⁴ Videor enim permultos Latinismos in Novo Test. reperisse v. g. Lucæ 12, 58. δὸς ἔργασίαν ἀπῆλλαχθαι: ubi vel cæcis manifestum est Romanum illud: Dare operam.

Nam tibi, quod nobis superest ignobilis otii,
Deputo, sive legas, quæ dabo, sive tegas.¹

Anno 1613. Julii 22.

Dignitati tuæ
devinctissimus,
JOH. SMITH.

LECTORI ΦΛΙΕΛΛΗΝΙ.

Cum superiorem scriberem epistolam, nihil profecto minus cogitavi, quam de hoc libro in lucem emittendo. Quare satis habui ornatissimo illi viro, cui pro Collegii consuetudine aliquod tunc temporis industriae specimen exhibendum fuit, meum in eum tum suscipiendo, tum perficiendo, consilium probasse. Nunc autem quandoquidem in tuas etiam manus hoc nostrum *πενήνυμα* perventurum est, oratum te maximopere cupio, (Lector Candide,) ne *Juellus* minoris apud te fiat jam palliatus, quam fuit olim togatus: Non sane quum multum intersit; veruntamen quia idem utrobique *Juellus* est, eodem loco esse convenit. Quanquam suspicor aliquos minime defuturos (ita hodie sibi placent homines aliorum scriptis censendis) qui me dum e Latino Græcum feci, rem novam præstitisse clament, atque adeo plane supervacuum. Næ isti nondum vidisse videantur *Erasmum* a *Caversino*, a *Garâ Ciceronem*, a *Scaligero Catonem*, *Cæsarem* ab *Anonymo* quodam, ab aliis alios jamdudum Græce versos: Alioqui puderet eos, vel novum dicere, quod tam multi, vel supervacuum, quod tam egregii viri facilitarunt.

Imo si² *Cassianum* illud ubique sit spectandum, *Cui bono*, e- quidem ipse expertus ausim affirmare, pueros Grammaticales, (quibus utique meum hoc, quicquid est opellæ, destinatum volo) citius e balbutientibus hujusmodi versionibus, quam e doctissimis Demosthenis Platonisve monumentis Græcæ linguae scientiam adepturos. Siquidem nusquam ita obtinet Conici dictum,³ ἀμα- θέστερον καὶ σαφέστερον, ac ubi cum tyrunculis agitur; qui, si modico præcedas intervallo, statim sectari solent: sin longius præcurras, aut nolunt omnino sequi, aut nesciunt consequi. At enim fortassis utiliter quidem hoc fieri posse non negas, præstantiorem duntaxat requiris artificem. Ita vero si tu sentis, mecum profecto sentis: nam et ego meæ probe sum conscius infirmitatis, et aliorum vires quas ignoro, majores esse credo. Quocirca timidus ac subinvitus Mehercles prodeco, necnon sicut Jupiter Homericus,⁴ ἐκὼν ἀέκοντι γε

¹ Auson. Epigr.

² Tull. orat. pro Sext. Rosc. Amerino.

³ Aristoph. in *Ranis* e *Bacchi* personâ.

⁴ *Iliad.* Δ.

θυμῶ. Nam quid amabo facerem, cum illi rogarent, quò imperare possent? Fallor, aut ipse obtemperasses. Et vero quia videbam Græcarum literarum studia sic apud plurimos frigere, ut eas prorsus negligant; sic a paucis coli, ut sibi tantum ac Musis canentes, nihil in communem usum proferant: putavi hac ratione cum illos cohortandos, tum hos coarguendos.

Nimis autem vereor (Pie Lector) ut faciat ad stomachum tuum, quod ἡ Δία sapientiusculè dixerim, idque in opere Christiano; non illud quidem ex antiquis Ecclesie partibus petitum, sed tamen spectatissimis Evangelii professoribus valde usurpatum. Nec absque ratione. Cum enim Theologi nostri, etiam qui melioris notæ sunt, Cœdepol, Ecæstor, et hoc genus alia libris suis Latinis scriptis passim inspergant; Ecquid Græcis tantumdem non conceditur? Aut si qua verbis nescit religio, quum ergo neiges Mysteriorum vocabulum à profanis et absurdis Græcorum superstitionibus primò fluxisse? Quid quod ipsi illi scriptores Exoterici, ἡ Δία (quoad ego conjicio) sic uti solent, ut affirmare magis, quam jurare videatur? Et nominquam certè, vel Adèò tantum significat, et sententiæ notat incrementum: vel prorsus vacat, nihilque aliud, quàm orationis lacunas explet. Sive igitur verbum hoc jam inde ab initio probum fuerit, sive postcà longo usu cœpit emolliui, seu denique magnorum auctorum exemplis aliquantum hic quoque audere liceat: quicquid est, non erit profectò c. andens tui, (Lector Optime) non humanitatis, quando de te ipsà tecum placè sentiam, vocolas meas sollicitius calumniari.

MOTS OU OMIS PAR H. ETIENNE,

Ou incorrectement expliqués.

Par J. B. GAIL, Lecteur et Professeur Royal de l'Institut de France.

No. II. [*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 219.*]

LES articles de cette 2^e série, ainsi que les précédents, offrent des interprétations non recueillies ça et là, mais produites pour la première fois. Je ne puis donc vous les adresser comme définitives et arrêtées: je crois donc, qu'avant de les adopter dans votre réimpression du précieux trésor d'H. Etienne, il convient de les annoncer dans votre Journal, et de les soumettre à la critique de vos compatriotes (οἱ τεῖραν ἔρχομαι). Leur suffrage peut seul mettre le sceau aux découvertes dont j'ai à cœur d'enrichir la critique grammaticale.

16. βρότος, οὐ, *homme* ; mais βρότος, avec l'accent sur la penultième, signifiera, dit-on, *sang mêlé de poussière, sang corrompu*. H. Etienne, après avoir, d'après Virgile et autres poètes Latins, souvent scholiastes des Grecs, donné *tabum*, (*pus, humeur virulente*) et *sanies*, (*sang décomposé, humeur sanguinolente*) comme version de βρότος, cite le βρότον αἱματόεντα d'Homère, (Il. xxiii. 41.) qu'Eustathe explique par τὸν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος μόλυσμὸν, *tache de sang*, et ajoute que le λύθρον d'Hesychius, *sang mêlé de poussière*, lui paroît répondre quelquefois au βρότος d'Homère. Sans contester à H. Etienne le rapprochement qu'il fait, je dirai que dans le passage d'Homère précité, l'interprétation d'Eustathe me plaît davantage.

Mais, dira-t-on, si βρότος signifie *tache de sang*, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος μόλυσμὸν, comment justifier l'épithète αἱματόεντα ? Nous la justifierons en répondant qu'Homère aime les pléonasmes, non pas ceux qui sont oiseux et rédundants,¹ mais ceux qui servent à produire un effet ou à faire une image. Or ici αἱματόεντα accompagne fort heureusement βρότον, et nous montre non pas une *petite tache de sang*, mais une *tache large*, et qui semble s'agrandir de cet adjectif composé de 5 syllabes.

17. εἰς, εἰς se prend-il pour ἐν ? oui, répondent H. Etienne, (t. i. p. 1156. C.) Maittaire, M. Sturz, M. Hermann, et tant d'autres critiques aussi justement célèbres : pour moi, j'oserois presque dire *non*. Pour étayer leur doctrine que je crois erronée, ils citent cette phrase de Deys d'Italie. (Liv. v. p. 276. ed. Francf. 1586.) ταῦτα τὰ γράμματα ληρότεροι οἱ καταλειφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, Τίτος Ἐρμήτριος καὶ Μ. Ὀράτιος ἀνέγνωσαν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, mais ils me paroissent se tromper. 1°. Après τυράννου, je mets une virgule ; 2°. je fais dépendre εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον non de καταλειφθέντες, mais de ἀνέγνωσαν. M. Sturz. (Lexic. Xen.) cite encore la phrase suivante : *roulez-vous*, dit Xenophon, (Icpr. v. 7.) *dissimuler les forces de la cavalerie, laissez en une partie à découvert, et cachez l'autre dans un endroit que n'appercevoit pas l'ennemi*, τοὺς δ' εἰς τὸ ἄδηλον ἀποκρύπτων. Ici, dira-t-on, εἰς τὸ ἄδηλον pour ἐν τῷ ἄδηλῳ ; erreur, car εἰς τὸ ἄδηλον dépend d'un verbe de mouvement sous-entendu ; ainsi ellipse à reconnoître ici.² J'aurai occasion d'expliquer ailleurs une foule d'exemples qu'on croiroit pouvoir m'opposer avec quelque avantage ; exemples, où εἰς signifie non pas *dans*, mais *en présence de* : distinction trop méconnue.

18. ἐπὶ avec le génitif se prend-il pour εἰς avec l'accusatif ? Oui, dira-t-on encore d'après H. Etienne, (t. i. p. 1209. F.) d'après Suidas, et d'après M. Heyne, expliquant ce vers d'Homère, (Il. iii. 5.) πέτονται ἐπ' Ἀκαιοῖσι βούων. Pour moi, ici encore, comme au précédent article, admettant *ellipse*, et non pas *atticisme*, (car l'ellipse est de tous

¹ Voy. ma Grammaire Grecque, p. 244. et la note 1.

² La phrase pleine et sans ellipse seroit, *cachant l'autre partie (de la cavalerie) amené dans un endroit non vu de l'ennemi*.

les dialectes) je dirai, la phrase pleine est, *les grues volent vers les rives (méridionales) de l'océan, eis ῥοὰς, et s'arrêtent sur ces rives, ἐπὶ ῥοάων.*

19. ἐπὶ, avec le génitif, fait souvent difficulté: exemples — ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, *se tenir à l'entrée du fleuve, et les pieds dans l'eau, comme si on alloit le traverser, mais ne le traversant pas.* Xen. *Av.* 4. 3. 28. t. iv. p. 134. de non Xénophon Grec-Latin-Fr. p. 134.

20. κακεῖω pour κατακεῖω, par syncope Éolique, dit un savant qui ajoute *quod est κοιμητικῶς ἔχειν*, dormiturer: cette notion est-elle exacte? oui, si l'on en croit soit H. Etienne, qui traduit *decumbere cupio*, soit Constantin, qui d'après Didyme rend κακεῖοντες par *dormituriunt*, en ajoutant *magis enim somni cupiditas quam tempus significatur, quod verbis istis in εἰω pene familiare est*, sicut πολέμῳ σεῖω bellaturio. Pour moi, fondé sur les principes des radicaux et des désinences, principes propres à prévenir quantité d'erreurs en Grec, en François, en Latin, je dirai, que le verbe κατακεῖω n'est point un verbe de désir, comme le prétend H. Etienne (*est*, dit-il, *hoc verbum desiderativum sicut multa alia in εἰω desinentia*); que la désinence de ce verbe est ω et non pas ει; que ει appartient uniquement au radical κει; et enfin que κατακεῖω signifie, *se mettre en place, étendre tout de son long; être couché, ou se coucher*: et, par extension, *dormir*. Voy. dans le *Classical Journal*, No. XXIII. le mot ῥιμφορματος, qui, ainsi que tant d'autres mots, me semble avoir été mal compris, faute de bien distinguer ce qui est radical de ce qui tient à la désinence.

21. πέλωμαι *sum, idem quod activum πέλω*, et πέλω poet. pour εἰμί. Telle est la doctrine de H. Etienne (p. 1624 et 1627. de son App.): mais ce mot n'a-t-il pas un autre sens plus vrai et plus digne d'attention? à l'idée d'être, à l'idée de *présence* ne joint-il pas celle de *présence* prenant part à ce qui se passe (comme l'intéresse des Latins), de *présence* agissante et efficace, comme dans ce vers d'Homère, (Il. xiii. 237, 238.) *συμπερτὴ δ' ἄρετὴ πέλει ἀνδρῶν καὶ μάλα λυγρῶν*, vers à l'occasion duquel M. Heyne s'écrie, *triantur grammaci et molestias faciunt*. Chez Sponde *συμπερτὴ* signifie *utile, avantageuse*; ensorte que Thoas auroit dit simplement que la force de plusieurs hommes d'ailleurs foibles est avantageuse; ce qui ne rend nullement toute la pensée d'Homère: car ce poète parle de forces réunies, tandis que dans l'interprétation de Sponde et autres, il n'est pas question de réunion.

D'autres traduisent, et très bien, l'adjectif *συμπερτὴ* par *in unum collata* (réunie), mais πέλει les embarrasse. Pour en sortir, ne pourroit-on pas, comme je l'ai dit en commençant, joindre à l'idée de présence, celle de présence agissante et efficace, et traduire littéralement: *la force de plusieurs hommes, même d'hommes le moins belli-*

queer, peut beaucoup (ou produit un grand effet) quand elle est réunie : et nous, (dit Thoas à Idoménée) nous savons (sommes exercés à) combattre contre des gens de cœur. Ainsi d'après cet exemple et tant d'autres, *πίλω* signifieroit être, mais surtout, être présent et prenant part à une chose, et, par extension, opérer puissamment, agir avec énergie, produire un grand effet. Ainsi loin de nous l'idée d'H. Etienne que la fonction de ce mot soit de s'employer poétiquement pour *εἰμὶ* sum. Xenophon ne se sert pas une seule fois de *πέλωμαι*, que je crois avoir rencontré dans Thucydide.

22. *ποικιλότραυλος, ὁ καὶ ἡ*. H. Etienne qui donne ce composé, et qui l'explique par *varie balbutiens*, auroit bien du citer la source où il puisoit. Daniel Scott qui lui en fait le reproche avant moi, supplée l'omission et cite les deux vers où se trouve *ποικιλότραυλος* en l'attribuant à un Anonyme, tandis que Reiske, Brunck, M. Harles et autres les adjugent à Théocrite. Voici les vers, *Εἰαρινὸν δὲ λειψυθλόγαυσιν ἀοιδᾶν Κόσσυται ἀχέουσιν ποικιλότραυλα μελῆ*. Scott les cite, donc, mais ne les explique pas. L'interprète Latin traduit, *Uerue autem stridulis cantibus Merula modulatur varie sonora carmina* : dans cette version, *variè* explique *ποικίλος*, mais le sens de *τραυλός* n'est certainement pas rendu par *sonorus*. *Sonorus*, *sonore*, qui rend des sons éclatans, ne convient certainement pas au merle. Dire que le merle rend des sons éclatans, attribuer ce sens au mot Grec, c'est faire une faute en histoire naturelle, et pécher contre le génie de la langue. En effet, à remonter à l'étymologie, *τραυλός* vient de *τραῖω* blisser ; mais l'idée de *blessures* ne conduit pas à celle de *sons éclatans*. En suivant donc l'étymologie que justifie les observations des naturalistes, je proposerois, *le merle à tremblante modulation, au gosier chevrotant*. En effet ses accents sont tremblans et interrompus. Pline dit du merle, *Merula astute canit, hyeme balbutit* : ce qui s'accorde mal avec l'épithète *εἰαρινὸν* de Théocrite. Que de plus habiles concilient le poète avec le naturaliste. Au reste, remarquons le *balbutiens* d'H. Etienne que lui a inspiré Pline, et qui avoit besoin, je crois, d'être commenté.

23. *ὑπέρ, ὑπὲρ* suivi d'un génitif est souvent mal compris. Je ne releverai pas en ce moment les inexactes interprétations qu'en donne H. Etienne. Je tâcherai de suppléer, en partie, à ce qu'il ne dit pas. Je prends un premier exemple dans Théocrite. Ce poète (id. 26. 4.) nomme l'asphodèle *τὸν ὑπὲρ γᾶς* : Reiske sous entend *γασόμενον*, et adopte la version *humī nascentem* ; M. Geoffroy traduit *l'asphodèle dont la terre est couverte* : Warton donne pour glose, *genus quoddam humilium* ; et moi, pour version, *le rampant asphodèle*. Mais en expliquant un texte difficile d'après des faits et d'après la nature, meilleur interprète que les lexicographes et les philologues, nous dirons que *τὸν ὑπὲρ γᾶς ἀσφῶδελον* signifie non *le rampant asphodèle*, mais, au contraire, *l'asphodèle qui ne rampe pas* : l'asphodèle, plante herbacée qui s'élève au dessus de terre, et qu'on peut mettre au rang des arbrisseaux puisqu'il a quelquefois deux coudées de haut : eussent qu'ici

ἐπὲρ n'est point du tout pour ἐπὶ sur, et qu'il signifie *au dessus de*, et présente l'idée non *de ramper sur*, mais *de s'élever au dessus de la terre*.

ἐπὲρ avec l'accusatif signifiera *ultrâ, au delà*: exemples — ἐπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾶν, *sauter par dessus les fossés*: ἐπὲρ τὸν Ἑλλησποντον οἰκεῖν, *habiter au delà de l'Hellespont*. Dans les exemples suivants, 1^o. τὸν Καττὸν τὸν ἐπὲρ Μακεδονίας (Xen. K. 11. 1.); 2^o. ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας τῆς ἐπὲρ Αἰγύπτου (Thuc. 2. 48. 1.); 3^o. Νύσαν τὴν ἐπὲρ Αἰγύπτου ἐοῦσαν ἐν τῇ Αἰθιοπῇ (Hérodote 2. 14.), ἐπὲρ signifiera *il au delà* ? non; mais je proposerai de traduire, 1^o. *le mont Citus qui avoisine la Macédoine, et non qui est au delà Mac doine*; 2^o. *de la partie de l'Éthiopie qui touche et domine l'Égypte*, que Theocrite appelle Χθαμαλὸς (id. 17. 79.); 3^o. *Nyse qui avoisine et domine l'Égypte, et qui est dans l'Éthiopie*, et non pas, avec un savant, *Nyse, ville d'Éthiopie, au dessus de l'Égypte*.

Nous le voyons, ἐπὲρ avec le sens d'*ultrâ, au delà*, doit être suivi d'un accusatif. Si l'on m'oppose l'ἐπὲρ ποταμοῖο d'Homère, (Il. xxiii. 73.) qui signifie *au delà du fleuve*, je répondrai qu'il y a ici ellipse, et que ποταμοῖο dépend de ποῖς sous-entendu, ἐπὲρ, elliptiquement, avec le génitif, au lieu de l'accusatif, ne doit pas plus surprendre que αἶδονδε, (Il. xxiii. 137.) qui est au génitif, elliptiquement, pour εἰς αἶδος δῶμον. Sur les prépositions, signes passifs, et qui jamais ne déterminent le cas, M. M. Wolf et Buttmann ont dit de très bonnes choses.

EURIPIDES EMENDATUS.

a G. B.

IN particula hujus Diarii nuperrime vulgata, video lectionem vulgatam in Hipp. 77. sibi nactam esse patronum, qui, dum vivus interfuit, vir quidem inter τοὺς πολυμαθέστατους nunquam nisi perhonorifice fuit acceptus, verum inter τοὺς κριτικωτάτους seu, si loqui malit candidus harum literarum et æquus judex, τοὺς ὑπερκατήχρας, non eodem in honore habendus, Jacobus, aio, Bryantus. Ille enim dicitur in quodam templo Dianæ dicato versus illos Euripidis celeberrimos posuisse inscriptos, quos Hippolytus fingitur canere imagini Dianæ impositurus coronam.

Σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
ἐνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βότα,
οὔτ' ἤλθε πω σίδηρος· ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον

μέλισσα λειμὸν ἔρινος αἴερχεται,
αἰῶς ὅς ποταμίαισι κηπέται ὀρώσιν.

Ubi tamen Bryantus adoptavit ἡὼς conjecturam Vossii, contra quem fortiter pugnat Brunckius alique, me quidem iudice, felicissime. Verum in me recipere ausim, ut comprobarem illum locum esse ab omnibus laudatum, a nemine intellectum, neque ab Euripide scriptum eo modo, quo libri exhiberi solent. En argumenta, quæ meam sententiam confirmare possunt. I. Σῆρος per se nusquam alibi significat *falcem messoriam*. II. Si locus hujusmodi reperiretur, quod non posse auguror, nusquam repertum iri confido cum ἡλθ conjunctum. III. Si ἡλθ-σῆρος sit proba locutio, in re tali esset plane inepta: etenim non ille lucus, cui nulla falx immititur, dici potest αἰείατο, verum is quem nemo vel hominum vel ceterorum animalium turbavit: quoniam vox non ducitur ab α non et κείρω *tondeo*, verum α non et κεράνομι *misceo*, vel κηραίνω, *corrupto*. IV. Rectius animato alicui quam inanimato μέλισσα poterat opponi. V. Patet e paodia Comici apud Athen. ix. p. 402. C. "Εν οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀέρι νέμειν βότα οὐτ' ἀσχεδωρὸς νεμούμενος καπρῶζεται animalis cujusdam nomen hic olim fuisse scriptum. VI. Ovidius in luco sacro pingendo nullam falcis immissæ, necne, mentionem facit, sed talem describit qualem *neque ovīs placidæ neque amanti sacæ capellæ Nec patulo tardæ carpitur ore bovis*. in Epist. Heroid. xvi. et, in Metam. iii. 408., *Quem neque pastores neque pastæ monte capellæ Contigerant, aliudve pecus, quem nulla volueris Nec fera turbat*: quasi piaculum esset messoris opera uti, sine qua lucus horridus fuisset, neque Deo satis dignus: e contra probe commemoravit falcem messoriam, dum pingit steriles maris oras *Quas neque cornigeræ morsu læscere juvenæ, Nec placidæ carpistis oves, hircæve capellæ. Non apis inde tulit collectos sedula flores: Non data sunt capiti genialia serta, neque unquam Fulciferæ secure manus*. VII. MS. Fl. longe præstantissimus omnium Codicum, qui hunc usque ad diem reliquias Euripideas conservant, modo quis probe dignoscere discat ejus lectiones, e quibus vel pravis non leve adjumentum ad probas eruendas trahi potest, opportune exhibet οὐδ' ἡλθ' πω σίδερος: ut inde crui possit ἡ θ' πρὸς οὐδ' ἄνους: mox pro ἀκέραιον legi debet ἀκέραιον: quod Hesych. exponit per ἀβλαβή. Sententiam unice illustrat Nostras Churchill in Poemate dicto *Gotham* iii. 491.

*The bee goes forth; from herb to herb she flies,
From flow'r to flow'r, and loads her lab'ring thighs
With treasur'd sweets, robbing those flow'rs, which left
Find not themselves made poorer by the theft:*

cui simile est illud in ejusdem poematis ii. 214.

walks o'er the opening flow'r,
Which largely drank all night of heav'n's fresh dew,
And, like a mountain nymph of Dian's crew,
So lightly walks, she not one mark imprints,
Nor brushes off the dew, nor soils the tints.

Verum neque sic integer est locus. Etenim versus tres, qui vulgo excerptum illud sequuntur, Hippolyti orationem ordiri debent. Ii vulgo exstant: "Ὅστις διδάκτον μὴδὲν ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεν εἰς τὰ πάντα ἀεὶ τούτοις ὑρέσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δ' οὐ θέμις. At plerique codices πάντα ὅμως: et unus MS. pro var. lect. ἔπεσθαι: hoc postremum est quantivis pretii: neque a vero longe abest τὰ πάντα ὅμως in τὸ πᾶν θέμις mutandum. Etenim modo in scenam intraverat Hippolytus, satellitibus stipatus, qui ἐν προσόδῳ carmen in Dianæ honorem accinunt, cujus initium est "Ἔπεσθ' ἄδοντες ἔπεσθαι: eo finito, Hippolytus, qui inter canendum personam egerat mutam, ad Dianæ aram accedit, manu gerens coronam Dei simulacro imponendam. Sed ante vulgus arcet, quam sacra iniit, nec nisi viros tam mentis integros quam corporis esse fas dicit sibi comites adjungere:

"Ὅστις διδάκτον μὴδὲν ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεν εἰς τὸ πᾶν, θέμις
τούτοις γ' ἔπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δ', οὐ θέμις.

quibus dictis, satellites dimovet et mox ad Deam convertit orationem:

Σὺ δὲ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω.
ἐνδ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἡξίου φέρβειν βότα,
οὔτ' ἡλθ' ποῦς οὐδ' ἄρνος· ἀλλ' ἀκήριον
μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἡρινὸς οἰεσθεται,
Αἰὼς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπεύει ὀρόσοις.

quæ sic reddi possunt Anglice—

He, whose unspotted heart no teacher owns
Save unsophisticated Nature, such
His steps may hither lead, but not the impure.
Dian, to deck thy brows this crown I bear
Of flow'rets from the mead untainted cull'd,
Where never herdsman led the grazing kine
Nor foot of lambkin trod: the vernal bee
May dare alone the meadow's sweets to sip,
Still unpolluted by the riffer's wing
That scarcely shakes the dew-drop—which, from font
As pure, the hand of Chastity repairs.

Cum versione nostra conferri potest illa Bryanti necnon Mureti,

quam neque a Valckenaero neque Monko appositam, ipse lubens exscribam.

Tibi hanc corollam, diva, nexilem fero,
 Aptam ex virentis pratuli intonsa coma.
 Quo neque protervum pastor unquam agit pecus,
 Neque falcis unquam venit acies improbæ :
 Apis una flores vere libat integros,
 Puris honestus quos rigat lymphis Pudor.
 Illis, magistri quos sine opera perpetem
 Natura docuit ipsa temperantiam,
 Fas carpere illinc ; improbis autem nefas.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

THE commentators on Virgil seem to acknowledge a difficulty in the following verse, which they have not, I think, succeeded in removing ; perhaps the following remarks may throw some light on the passage.

Conscendit furibunda rogos, enseque recludit
 Dardanium, non hos quasitum munus in usus. *Æneid*, lib. iv. 647.

Here the words, *non hos quasitum munus in usus*, which are generally translated, *a present not intended for such purposes*, lead some critics to infer, that Æneas had made Dido a present of a sword, and in this sense it would appear that Ovid had considered it in his Epistle from Dido to Æneas,

Quam bene conveniunt fato tua munera nostro
 Instruis impensa nostra sepulchra brevi. *Ep.* vii. 187.

and afterwards,

Hoc tamen in tumuli marmore carmen erit ;
 Præbuit Æneas et causam mortis, et ensem.
 Ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu.

But, notwithstanding the high authority of Ovid, it may be fairly questioned whether any such present was given by Æneas ; the presents he did give to Dido are all formally enumerated in the first book, v. 647-655. They consist of a mantle, a veil, a sceptre, a necklace, and a crown ; but there is no *sword* in the list, and if any had been given, it would, I presume, have been mentioned with the rest. The commentators, therefore, aware of this objection, pretend that it was a present to Æneas, which, in his hurry to fly from Dido, he had left with some other things in his bed-chamber, as in verse 495.

— arma viri thalamo quæ fixa reliquit.
and 507.

— super exuvias enseque relictum.

See Davidson's Virgil, and the following note in the Delphin Edition. "At non ait *datum*, sed *casu relictum* in cubiculo. Nec obstat quod cum *munus* appellet. Sic enim ait: *non hos quæsitum munus in usus*, id est, *non hos in usus quæsitum et comparatum ab Ænea, cui munèris loco datus ab aliquo alio fuerat.*" But there was no occasion for the *ab aliquo alio* of the commentator, as he might have seen a little farther back that Dido had given Æneas a sword as well as a garment, "*dives quæ munera Dido fecerat.*" lib. iv. 260. If the sword must therefore be considered a *gift*, it is clearly the gift of Dido. The translators, however, seem at a loss in what way to take it. Dr. Trapp leaves the matter doubtful.

— "Unsheaths the Trojan sword
A present not designed for such a use."

And Dryden gets rid of the difficulty, by leaving out the *gift* entirely:

"Unsheaths the sword the Trojan left behind,
Not for so dire an enterprize design'd."

I find also in the Greek version of Virgil performed by the orders of Catherine II. Empress of Russia, that *munus* is rendered *χειμήλιον*, which converts the sword into a piece of household furniture.

Βῆ τε πυρὸν μεγάλην εἴρουσσε τε ἐκ κολεῶν
Δαρδάνιον ξίφος, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ χειμήλιον ἔργῳ.

The question, however, of *chattel*-property is supposed to be in favor of Dido, who had given the sword to Æneas, 'Εκείνο δὲ τυχὸν ὑπῆρχε τὸ ξίφος, ὅπερ Ἑρμῆς Αἰνείαν κατέληφεν ἐξωσμένον. (Ανωτ. στιχ. 207.) Yet Delille, who had doubtless all these authorities before him, is of a different opinion, and assigns the *donatio mortis causa* to Æneas.

"Monte au bucher, saisit le glaive du héros,
Ce glaive à qui son cœur demande le repos,
Ce ter à la beauté donné par le courage,
Hélas ! et dont l'amour ne prévit point l'usage !"

Helas! indeed we may all exclaim with Monsieur Delille, for surely no such *usage* was ever before made of this unfortunate instrument.

Now I am inclined to think that the origin of all these vague conjectures with regard to the sword may be traced to the word *munus*, which the commentators seem, strangely enough, to have considered alone under the limited sense of *gift*, instead of *oblation* or *offering*, which is the genuine, and, as I hope to show, the proper signification of the term in the passage above quoted. To

prove this we have only to consider the purpose for which the sword was required.

When Dido, in consequence of the treacherous conduct and meditated flight of Æneas, had determined on her own death, she endeavoured to conceal her purpose from her sister, and had recourse to a stratagem to effect it. She pretended that the Priestess of the Massylian nation, a mighty sorceress, who was able to release souls from the power of love, had undertaken either to restore to her Æneas's love, or to banish his image entirely from her breast. For this purpose she requested her sister to erect a funeral pile, and place upon it his *arms* which he had left in her bed-chamber, together with his *clothes* and the *nuptial bed*, as the priestess, she said, had directed her to destroy every monument of that execrable man. The stratagem succeeded, for "Anna never imagined that her sister meditated death under the pretext of these *unusual rites*."

Non tamen Anna *rogs* pretextu funera *sacris*

Germanam credit:—aut graviora timet quam morte Sichæi. lib. iv. 502.

The *arms*, *clothes*, &c. were therefore the pretended *offerings*, (*munera*) which she said she had prepared for Jupiter Stygius, in order to put a period to her miseries, and commit to the flames the Trojan pile.

Sacra Jovi Stygio, quæ rite incepta paravi,

Percipere est animus, finemque imponere curis

Dardaniq.ue rogi capitis p.mittere flammæ. v. 641.

The various preparations for the pretended sacrifice are minutely described—"Upon the bed she lays his *clothes*, the *sword* he had *left*, and his *image*.—Altars are also raised around, and the priestess, with hair dishevelled and a thundering voice, invokes three hundred gods, and Erebus, and Chaos, and threefold Hecate;"¹ and when every thing is prepared she contrives to dismiss Barce, the nurse of Sichæus, under the pretext of calling her sister to finish the sacrifice begun with proper rites. Then, having unsheathed the Trojan sword, an *offering* certainly not required (*quæsitum*) for such a purpose, she accomplishes her fatal design.

Conscendit furibunda rogos ensemque recludit

Dardanum; non hos quæsitum munus in usus.

This I take to be the true sense of the passage. Dido had deceived her sister by a mock sacrifice, for which the *arms*, *clothes*, &c. of Æneas were originally requested as *munera* or oblations. This is shown by the sister's astonishment on discovering the fraud.

Hoc illud, germana, fuit; me fraude petebas?

Hoc rogi iste mihi, hoc ignes, aræque parabant?

¹ Lib. iv. 510.

The etymology of *munus* is supposed to be uncertain. It certainly approximates in sound and sense to the Hebrew מנחה an offering, from the verb מנח, Arabic مَنَحَ donavit, munere donove affecit,¹ and in this sense it is almost every where used in Virgil.

A. LOCKETT.

7, Sackville Street, Nov. 27, 1815.

PRICES

Of some of the principal Books of the well-known and celebrated Library of the late RALPH WILLETT, Esq. brought from his Seat at Merly, in the County of Dorset; which was sold by Auction, by LEIGH and SOTHEY, December 6, 1813, and 16 following days.

55 AUCTORES CLASSICI, 24 tom. uniform, Lond. Brindley, 1744, 54l. —8l.

————— Horatius, Virgilius, Terentius, et Juvenal, cum fig. 7 vol. 1. p., uniform, gilt, Lond. Sandby, 1749-63. —4l. 15s.

96 Aetini (Francisci) Oratoris preclarissimi in eloquentissimas Phalaridis tyranni epistolas per ipsum e Græco in Latium versas Hoc Oposculum in Alma universitate Oromæ, A Natali christiano Ducentessima et nonagesima septima Olimpiade feliciter impressum e. Hoc Theodericus rood quem collonia misit Sanguinem g'manus nobile possit opus atque sibi socius thomas fuit anglicus hunte. —85l. 1s.

97 Aristidis Opera, Gr. et Lat. a S. Jebb, 2 tom. 1. p. Oxon. 1722. —9l.

105 Augustinus (Aur.) de Singularitate Clericorum, blue morocco, gilt, (Colonix) Olricus zel de Hanau, MCCCCLXVII. [This is the second book, with a date, in which the name of Ulric Zel appears as the printer.] —17l. 17s.

106 Augustini Datti Elegantiolæ. Venet. Bapt. de Sessa, MCCCXCI. —4l. 14s. 6d.

111 Æsopi Vita et Fabellæ, &c. Gr. et Lat. red morocco, gilt. Venet. ap. Ald. 1505. —14l.

140 Aristotelis Opera, Gr. 6 tom. with initial letters illum. Venet. Ald. MCCCXCV. —VIII. —42l. 1s.

¹ Or perhaps from the Hebrew מנח, Arabic مَنَحَ largitus fuit, exprobrauit et benefacta. The noun is used in Arabic in the sense of a gift or divine favor.

141 Aristoteles, Gr. et Lat. a G. du Vallio, 4 tom. l. p. gilt. Paris, 1654. - 18*l.* 18*s.*

145 Atkyns', Sir R., Gloucestershire, portrait and plates, 1712. - 15*l.*

148 Augustæ Historiæ Scriptores, Ed. Princ., 2 tom. blue morocco, gilt, (first leaf reprinted) Mediol. Philip. de Lavignia, MCCCCLXXV. - 8*l.* 15*s.*

152 Aulus Gellius, ex recognitione J. Andrea, et cum ejusdem præf. ad Paulum H. Ed. Princ., red morocco, gilt. Rom. in Domo Petri de Max. MCCCCLXIX. - 12*l.*

153 ———— russiæ. ib. MCCCCLXXII. 16*l.* 16*s.*

281 Bessarionis, Cardinalis Sabinis, &c. adv. Calumniatores Platonis, Libri V. Ed. Princ., red morocco, gilt, initial letters illuminated. Rom. Contr. Sweynh. et Arn. Pann. MCCCCLXIX. - 15*l.* 10*s.*

283 Biblia Polyglotta, studio opera et impensis Cardinalis Francisci Ximenes de Cisneros, 6 tom. gilt. Complut. de Brocario, 1514-17. 63*l.*

284 ———— Sacra Polyglotta, a B. Walton, et Castelli (Edm.) Lex. cum iconibus, 8 tom. 1657-69 53*l.* 11*s.*

285 ———— sacra Latina 2 tom. red moroc., gilt, Moguntia, Jo. Fust et Petrus Schoeffer de Gernsheym, MCCCCLXII. - 105*l.* (See De Bure, No. 25, page 41.)

286 ———— red moroc. gilt. Norimb. Antonius Coburger, MCCCCLXXV. - 11*l.* 15*s.*

287 ———— - printed on Vellum, with initial letters beautifully illuminated, 2 vol. bound in red moroc. gilt. Venet. Nico. Jenson, MCCCCLXXVI. - 168*l.*

288 ———— Germanice, without name of printer, place, or date. - 15*l.* 15*s.*

296 Biblia Pauperum, sive Historiæ veteris et Novi Testamenti, figuris representata, printed from wood-blocks, blue moroc. gilt. 257*l.* 5*s.* [This work is placed by Heineken as the *first* in the order of those books which were printed by means of wooden blocks; and a very particular description of this edition will be found in Schellhorn's *Antiquitates Literariæ*, vol. iv. p. 293 - 300. See also the *Idée Generale*, &c. p. 292—300. The present is a very fine copy; each leaf, in its original form and dimensions, being inlaid; and the whole bound in blue morocco.]

412 Bonifacii, Papæ VIII. Liber sextus decretalium, cum apparatu Joh. Andrea, printed on Vellum, red moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Pet. Schoeffer, MCCCCLXXXIII. - 27*l.* 6*s.*

437 Britannia Illustrata, plates, 4 vol. l. p. 1709-24. - 30*l.* 9*s.*

445 de Bry, Collectiones Peregrinationum in Indiam Orient. et Indiam Occident., XXV. partibus comprehensæ; Opus illustratum, fig. aeneis fratrum de Bry et Meriani, 7 tom. blue moroc., gilt, Francof. 1590-1634. - 120*l.* *Note.* The above is a very fine copy of this rare Book, and is complete according to De Bure, except 10 leaves published by Merian in 1634, at the end of the first part; Part 4th the Map; Part 2d. of the 2d. Collection a Decatory Preface of John Hughes, of Lintscot; Part 3d. a Map of New Zembla; Part 9, three plates.

453 *Byzantinæ Historiæ Scriptores*, 37 tom. l. p. ruled. (Pachymeres, sm. pa. not ruled). Paris 1648-1755. - 47*l.* 5*s.*

456 *Cæsaris (C. Julii) Commentariorum de Bello Gallico, Libri VII. et de Bello Civili, Libri III.* initial letters illumin. bound in Vellum, (T. Croft's Copy). Venet. Nic. Jenson, MCCCCLXXI. - 10*l.* 10*s.*

457 ——— *Opera, cum annot. S. Clarke, cum fig. second paper.* Lond. 1712. - 10*l.* 10*s.*

554 *Ciceronis Opera*, Oliveti, 9 tom. Paris, 1740. 25*l.* 4*s.*

587 *CATHOLICON*—Balbi de Balbis vel Johannis de Janua quæ vocatur Catholicon, Ed. Princ., yellow moroc. gilt. Mogunt. per Jo. Gutenberg. MCCCCLX.—66*l.* 18*s.*

604 *CHESS*—*The Game and Playe of the Chess, Translated out of the French, and imprinted by William Carton*, wood cuts, red moroc. gilt, no place or date, second edit. - 173*l.* 5*s.*

607 *Ciceronis (M. Tullii) Epist. ad M. Brutum, ad Q. Frat. ad Octavium, et ad Atticum; ex recogni. Jo. Andræ et cum ej. epist. ad Paulum II.* Ed. Princ., russia. Rom. Conrad Sweynh. et Arn. Pann. MCCCCLXX. 31*l.* 10*s.*

608 ——— *Epist. ad Famil. Absque loci et Typographi indicatione*, Venet. Christ. Valdarfer, MCCCCLXX. 8*l.* 8*s.*

609 *Ciceronis Officia*, printed on vellum, with the initial letters illum., red moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Jo. Fust, MCCCCLXVI. - 73*l.* 10*s.*

610 ——— *Officia, Paradoxa et de Amicitia.* Neap. MCCCCLXXIX. - 5*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

611 ——— *Rhetoricorum Libri IV. et de Invent. Libri II. ex recens. Omniboni Leoncenti*, Ed. Princ., yellow moroc. Venet. Nic. Jenson, MCCCCLXX. - 18*l.*

612 *The Boke of Cullie of Old Age and Friendship, &c.* russia, Emprinted by me Symple Personne, William Carton, MCCCCLXXXI. - 210*l.*

719 *Clementis, Papa Quinti, Constitutiones, cum apparatu Joh. Andræ, Episcopi Meriensis*, Ed. Princ., printed on vellum, blue moroc. gilt. Mogunt. Joh. Fust et Pet. Schoeffer de Gernsh. MCCCCLX. - 60*l.* 5*s.*

748 *Demosthenes Gr.* 2 tom. in 1, red moroc. gilt. Venet. in Ædib. Aldi. 1504. - 18*l.* 18*s.*

754 *Dictes and Sayengis of the Philosophers*, red morocco, gilt leaves. Reverse of last leaf, Et sic est finis. Emprinted by me William Carton, at Westmestre, the Here of our Lord MCCCCLXXVII. At end, A Manuscript Copy of the morale proverbes of Christyne, Emprinted by Carton, in feuerer the colde Season, i. e. MCCCCLXXVII. - 96*l.* 10*s.*

806 *Erasmii Stultitiæ Laus*, cum fig. Holbein. Basil, 1676. - 2*l.* 18*s.*

902 *ERCOLANO. Antichita d'Ercolano da Ottav. Ant. Bayardi*, con fig. 8 tom. Nap. 1757, 92—*Catal. degli Antichi Monum. di Ercol. da Ottav. Ant. Bayardo.* Nap. 1754. - 59*l.* 17*s.*

1035 *Froissart (Jehan) Cronique*, 4 tom. en 2, red moroc. gilt and marble leaves. Lyon, 1559-61. - 15*l.* 13*s.*

1059 *Bower (John) Confessio Amantis*—Emprinted at West.

mestre, by me William Carton, and finished the 11th Day of Septembre, the first Here of the Regne of King Richard the Third, the Here of our Lord MCCCCLXXXIII. (misprint MCCCXCIII.)—315*l*.

1062 Grævii, J. G. Antiquit. Rom., 12 tom.—Gronovii Jac. Antiquit. Gr., 13 tom.—Poleii, Joan. Supplem., 5 tom.—Sallengre Alb. Hen. de Antiquit. Rom., 3 tom.—33 tom. fig., russia, l. p. Venet. 1732-7.—57*l*. 15*s*.

1124 Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary, plates, 9 vol., l. p. Oxford, 1746-7.—57*l*. 15*s*.

1130 Gulielmi Roperi Vita D. Th. Mori, portrait, l. p. 1716.—26*l*. 15*s*. 6*d*.

1162 Homeri Ilias, Gr. et Lat. a Clarke, 2 tom. 1729, 32—Homeri Odyssea, Gr. et Lat. a Clarke, 2 tom. 1740—23*l*. 10*s*.

1179 Hamilton's, Hon. W. Etrusc. Gr. and Rom. Antiquities, Fr. and English, plates, 4 vol. Naples, 1766. 46*l*. 4*s*.

1204 Homeri Opera Gr. cum pref. Gr. Demetrii Chalcondylæ et latina Bernardi Nerhi, Ed. Princ. 2 tom. vellum, gilt. Florent. MCCCCLXXXVIII.—88*l*. 4*s*.

1206 Homeri Opera Gr. cum Comment. Eustath. et Indice, Gr. 4 tom. in 3, red moroc., gilt. Rom. 1542-50—58*l*. 16*s*.

1209 Horatius Flaccus, Quintus, Absque anni, loci et typographi Indicet., blue moroc. Circa. MCCCCLXXII.—37*l*. 16*s*. [See De Bure, No. 2711, page 312; also Santander, vol. 3, page 34.]

1210 ————— red moroc., gilt. Mediol. Ant. Zarottus, MCCCCLXXIV.—18*l*. 18*s*. [This is the first edition with a date; but this copy wants the second vol., which contains the Commentaries of Acrio and Porphyrio.]

1211 ————— Opera, cum Comment. Christ. Landini, Ed. Princ. of the Commentary of Landinus. Florent. Ant. Miscominus, MCCCCLXXXII.—6*l*. 6*s*.

1212 ————— Christophori Landini, Ed. Princ., red moroc. Florent. Ant. Miscom. MCCCCLXXXII.—10*l*. 15*s*.

1214 Horatii Opera, cum fig. Argent. Jo. Reinh. cognom. Gurning. MCCCXCVIII.—13*l*. 13*s*.

1215 Horatius. Parmæ, 1791.—6*l*. 10*s*.

1340 Johannis Sancti Evangelistæ Historia, ejusque visiones apocalyplicæ, printed from wooden blocks, green moroc., gilt.—42*l*. [This edition is considered by Heineken as the *first* of those of the *Apocalypse* printed from wooden blocks; but it is doubtful whether it be not the second, or even third. Whatever be the correct date of it, the copy under description is in very fine and genuine condition in old French-green morocco binding.]

1345 Josephus, Gr. et Lat. Havercampi, 2 tom. l. p. Amst. 1726.—10*l*.

1371 Lactantii Firmiani Opera, Ed. Princ., red moroc., gilt. In Monast. Sublacensi, MCCCCLXV.—40*l*. 19*s*.

1469 Lucretius, Havercampi, cum fig., 2 tom. Lug. Bat. 1725.—6*l*.

1483 Livii Historia Romana, initial letters illum., russia. Mediol. Aut. Zarotus, MCCCCLXXX.—7*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

1493 Lucretius de Rerum Natura, red moroc., gilt. Veron. Paul. Fridenb. MCCCCLXXXVI.—19*l.*

1646 Meninski (Franc. a Mesg.) Thes. Ling. Orient. 5 tom., russia. Vien. Aust. 1680-7.—35*l.* 14*s.*

1657 Montfaucon (Bernard de) Antiquité expliquée, avec Suppl. fig. 10 tom. in 15, l. p. ib. 1719-24.—39*l.* 18*s.*

1672 Mirrour of the Worlde or Thymage of the same, red moroc., gilt. sec. ed. Carton, me fieri fecit.—136*l.* 10*s.*

1777 Orogium Sapientie. Thus endeth this present boke composed of diuerse fructfull ghostly maters of whiche the forsende names followen to thentent that wel disposed persones that desiren to here or rede ghostly Informacons maye the soon er knowe by this lityll Intyteling the effectis of this said lityll booke, in asmoche as the hole content of this lityll boke is not of one mater conln as here after ye maye knowe.

The fyrst treatyse is named Orogium Sapientie with *IIII.* chapitours followynge, shewing *IIII.* poyntes of true loue of euerlastyng Wisdom.

The seconde treatyse sheweth *IIII.* prouffytes tribulacyon wnth *IIII.* chapitours followynge.

The thyrde treatyse sheweth the holy rule of Saynt Venet whiche is right necessary to be knowen to al men and Wyemen of Religion that understonde noo laten whiche sheweth *IIIIIIIIII.* poyntes to be obserued.

Emprinted at Westmynstre (by William Carton) by desyring of certeyn Worshippfull persones. See Dibdin's Ames, vol. 1st. p. 430, &c.—194*l.* 5*s.*

1781 Ovidii Opera, Burmanni, 4 tom. in 8, l. p. Amst. 1727.—24*l.* 10*s.*

1782 Ovidii Metamorphoses, Lat. et Fr. par Banier, avec fig. gravées par les soins de le Mire et Basan, 4 tom. Paris, 1767-71.—17*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

1806 Patrick, Lowth, Whitby, and Arnald's Commentary on the Old and New Testament, 7 vol. 1744-66.—11*l.*

1810 Pausanias, Gr. gilt leaves. Venet. in Edib. Aldi. 1516.—4*l.* 4*s.*

1823 Petrarca (Francesco) Sonetti e Triomphi Ediz. pr., ruled with red lines, russia, gilt. Venet. Vind. de Spira, MCCCCLXX. [wanting Table Alphabet. 7 leaves.]—52*l.* 10*s.*

1967 Plautus, in usum Delph. 2 tom. Paris, 1679.—4*l.* 4*s.*

1972 Plutarchi Vitæ Parallelæ, Gr. et Lat. Bryani, 5 tom. 1729.—8*l.* 15*s.*

1987 Quintiliani Opera, Burmanni, 4 tom. l. p. Lug. Bat. 1720.—7*l.* 7*s.*

1994 Pitisci (Sam.) Lexicon Antiquit. Rom. fig. 2 tom. l. p. russia. Leovard. 1713.—13*l.* 13*s.*

1996 Platonis Opera, Gr. 2 tom. red moroc. gilt. Venet. in Edib. Aldi, 1513.—14*l.* 14*s.*

1999 Plautus, ex recensione G. Alexandrini. Venet. Jo. de Colou. MCCCCLXXII.—21*l*.

2000 Plinii Secundi Hist. Nat., with initials illum., red moroc. gilt. Venet. Nic. Jenson, MCCCCLXXII.—10*l*. 10*s*.

2026 Prynne's (Wm.) Records, with frontispiece to second vol., 3 vol. russia, 1.p. 1665-70—125*l*. 2*s*. [Note in vol. 2. Dr. Rawlinson told me there were only twenty-three copies of this volume remaining in England, the rest having been burnt with Ratchliffe's warehouses in the Fire of London, 1666. J. WEST.]

2027 Psalmodium Codex, Latine, printed on vellum, black moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Jo. Fust et Pet. Schoiffer de Gernsh. MCCCCLIX.—63*l*.

2030 Ptolemæi Cosmographia, ex emendatione Domitii Chaldei, cum 16 chartis, red moroc. gilt. Rom. Arn. Buckink. MCCCCLXXVIII.—31*l*. 10*s*.

2138 Saona (Laurentii Guillemi de) ordinis minorum Rhetorica Nova. Impressum fuit hoc presens opus Rhetorice facultatis apud villam sancti Albani, Anno domini, MCCCCLXXX.—79*l*. 16*s*.

2156 Quintilliani Institutiones Oratoriæ, initial letters illum., ruled with red lines, blue moroc., gilt and marbled leaves, by Padeloup. Paris, Vascosan, 1838.—8*l*. 8*s*.

2195 Salustio Conjuracion de Catilina y la Guerra de Jugurtha, russia, gilt. Madrid, 1772.—9*l*. 10*s*.

2198 Sandrart (Joach. Von) OPERA VARIA.—L'Academia Todesca della Archit., Scult., et Pitt., Germ. 2 tom. Norimb. 1675—Iconologia Deorum, Germ. ib. 1680—Il Giardini di Roma, ib.—Academia nobilissime Artis Pilloria, Lat. ib. 1683—Sculpturæ veteris Admiranda (with considerable number of additional plates at the end of this volume), Romæ Antiquæ et Novæ Theatrum, ib. 1684—Insignium Romæ Templorum Conspectus, ib. (with Pron's Views about Rome, and some Statutes in addition)—Romanorum Fontinalia, ib. 1685—Ovidii Metam., Germ. ib. 1698—et Bibliæ Icones, per Matt. Merian. The whole uniformly bound in 8 vol. red moroc. gilt.—63*l*.

2223 Senecæ Opera, cum not. Var., 3 tom. Amst. Elz. 1672.—5*l*. 5*s*.

2306 Sulpitii Verulamii oratoris præstantissimi opus insigne Grammaticum feliciter incipit Lond. per Richardum Pynson, MCCCXCIV.—42*l*.

2312 Taciti Opera, a Brotier, 4 tom. 1.p. Paris, 1771.—33*l*. 10*s*.

2322 Scheuchzeri (J. J.) Physica Sacra, a J. A. Pfeffel, cum 750 fig. et indice, 5 tom. Aug. Vind. 1731-5.—26*l*.

2345 Speculum Humanæ Salvationis, printed from wooden blocks, cum figuris, ligno incis, blue moroc.—315*l*. [Note.—This is the first edition of the Latin publication under the above name; and seems conformable to the designation of it given by Heineken, at page 441 of his Idée Generale, &c. It is, in consequence, exceedingly curious; as presenting a specimen of a very early printed book, of which a third part is executed from blocks, both in the cuts and the type: of the remaining two third parts, the cuts are uniformly executed in wood, and the text is printed from metal types. The fac simile which Heineken has given of the first two cuts, and of part of

the text, is very much inferior to the original : an inference, which Heineken himself is compelled to admit.]

2346 *Speculum Humanæ Salvationis*. Belgice, cum fig. ligno incis, red moroc.—252l. [Note.—Meerman has been more fortunate in his fac-simile of the first two cuts of this impression, than Heineken in those of the preceding one. The fac-simile of the type is, however, much inferior in strength and proportion. The cuts are all executed upon wood ; and worked off, like the previous ones, in bistre-colored ink. The type is uniformly metal, and the ink very black.]

2531 *Valerius Maximus*, red morocco. Venet. Vind. de Spir. MCCCCLXXI.—16l. 10s.

2720 *MISSALE ROMANUM*, supposed to be about the 16th Century, containing 72 capital illuminations, the borders most delicately and highly finished, with grotesque figures, ornaments, flowers, fruits, insects, &c. The letters of the text highly enriched with gold.—105l. [N. B. This splendid Missal belonged to Mr. West.]

Literary Intelligence.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Plotini Liber de Pulcritudine. Ad codicum fidem emendavit, annotationem perpetuam, interjectis Danielis Wyttenbachii notis, epistolamque ad eundem, ac præparationem cum ad hunc librum tum ad reliquos, adjecit Fredericus Creuzer. Accedunt Anecdota Græca ; Procli disputatio de Unitate et Pulcritudine, Nicophori Nathanaelis Antitheticus adversus Plotinum de Anima, itemque Lectiones Platonice maximam partem ex codd. MSS. enotatæ. Heidelbergæ, 1814.

The Editor has given to this obscure treatise by his preparatory dissertation as much perspicuity as ingenuity and learning could effect. To this publication is prefixed a letter to Wyttenbach, in which he refutes the attacks of M. Tittman against him. But he is not satisfied with this defence ; he celebrates the domestic and learned character of M. Wyttenbach's niece. We shall follow the example of the ingenious and excellent M. Millin in quoting that character :

“ In omni autem genere officiorum quo me meosque obstrinxisti, ut in singulis rebus, quæ vitam honestam cultamque reddunt, egregiâ uti soles sociâ ministrâque Ianá Gallien, nepie Tuâ, quæ parentis loco Te veneratur et adamat. Neque enim ejus verecundiam mihi obesse committam, ne gratum certe animum eidem hæc datâ occasione profitear. Et nosti sæpiusculum mecum mirari me singulare ingenium virginis, Wyttenbachii. Nihil illâ modestius vidi, nil urbanius, nihil facetius eruditiusque. Nam quod aliæ in mundo suo habent, anellos, myrothecia, flosculos, alia : pro his ea Homerum, Platonem, Plutarchum cum Virgilio habet. Neque tamen eadem pro fuso cala-

mun, pro lanâ librum tractare solet, verum quas ipsa a negotiis statis communibusque horas eximit, eas vel commentando vel lectioni vel humanitatis sale sparsis sermonibus solet impendere. Itaque ut uxori meæ in rerum domesticarum curis suo consilio utiliter adfuit, ita in litterario genere negotiorum mihi istic officiosissima internuntia exstitit. Neque jactat sese in eis et ingenii et institutionis bonis, sed ut ceterum candidissima est et simplicissima, ita ea ipsa dissimulat et contegit. Cumque latine calleat luculenter, græcum etiam sermonem non leviter combibere cœperit, francice autem nec minus germanice ita scribat, ut ambiga, utrum commodius faciat: tamen usque et usque premit quæ commentata est; neque unquam arbitror editum iri, ni Tu patriâ utaris potestate in eam, quæ filie pietatem Tibi præstat in aliis rebus omnibus. Insunt vero ut in ipsius moribus ac sermone, sic item in epistolis, quæ istinc missitantur, miræ quædam argutiæ ac Veneres, adjuncto candore et virginali quâdam in ipsis quoque verbis conspicuâ pudiciâ."

M. T. Ciceronis trium Orationum, pro Scauro, pro Tullio, pro Flacco, partes ineditæ cum antiquo Scholiaste item inedito ad orationem pro Scauro. Invenit, recensuit, notis illustravit Angelus Majus, Biblioth. Ambros. a Ling. Orient. Mediolani, 1814.

It was usual, in the dearth of paper in the middle ages, to write across the lines of ancient MSS. The Monks of those times frequently copied the works of the Fathers and other modern writers on the fainter copies of the Classics. Over the MS. which contained the fragments brought to light by M. Majo had been written the poems of Sedulius, who lived in the 5th century. This MS. is supposed to be of the 2d or 3d century, and the new writing of the 7th or 8th. On the discovery M. Majo broke out into the following exclamation: "O Deus immortalis, quid demum video! En Ciceronem, en lumen Romanæ facundiæ indignissimis tenebris circumseptum!"

These fragments consist of 36 octavo pages. The most considerable is that *pro Scauro*. This is the more fortunate as very little remains of that oration. That *pro Tullio* contains eight pages. Of that *pro Flacco* little is given, but that little is useful in completing some mutilated passages.

The MS. contains likewise a fragment of the oration *pro Cælio*, but it presents nothing new. The editor has added a descriptive dissertation and a fac-simile of a page of the MS.

A new Edition of the *Greek Testament*, in three volumes, octavo, printed from Griesbach's Text, and containing copious notes from Hardy, Raphel, Kypke, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, &c. in familiar Latin. Together with parallel passages from the Classics, and with references to Vigerus for Idioms and Bos for Ellipses.—By the Rev. Ed. Valpy, B. D. Master of Norwich School. Price 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* large paper 4*l.*

Ovidii Metamorphoses Selectæ, et in usum Scholarum expurgatæ; cum notis Anglicis. By the Rev. C. Bradley, A. M. 4*s.* 6*d.* bound.

Callimachi quæ supersunt Recensuit et cum Notarum Delectu

Edidit C. J. Blomfield, A. M. Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigias nuper Socius. Londini, 1815. Pr. 14s. Oct.

The Rev. Mr. Wilson has just published an expurgated Edition of *Juvenal* for Schools, with English notes.

An Enquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or received Text of the N. Testament. By the Rev. F. Nolan, a Presbyter of the United Church. 1815. Pr. 18s. Oct.

Miscellaneous Tracts of Professor Porson, by the Rev. T. Kidd. Pr. 14s. Oct.

In an early No. we shall present our readers with some account of this valuable work; in the mean time it may be useful to give the Table of Contents:

Imperfect outline of the Life of R. P.—Preface—Addenda—Epitaph on Alexis—Review of P. H. of V. J. of Schutz's *Eschylus*—Review of Brunck's *Aristophanes*—Review of Weston's *Hermesianax*, etc.—Review of Huntingford's *Apology for the Monostrophics*—The learned Pig.—Notæ breves ad Clerici et Bentlen Epistolas—Review of Robertson's *Parian Chronicle*—Review of Dr. Edwards's *Pseudo-Plutarch, de Educatione Liberiorum*—Corrector Lectori *Virgilii Londiniensis*; cura Heyne—Review of Mr. R. P. Knight's analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet—John Nic. Dawes on the Hiatus—Nursery Song—Supplementa ad Indicem Brunckianum in *Sophoclem*, ad *Euripidem Beckii*, ad *Simplicium in Epictetum*, ad *Cebetis Tabulam*—*Lacuna Lapidis Egyptiaci conjecturis suppletæ*—Addenda ad Appendicem in *Touppium Suidæ Kusteriani Emendatorem*, ad *Comicorum Græcorum Fragmenta*, ad *Pælationem in Euripidem et Supplementum*, ad *Hecubam*, ad *Orestem*, ad *Phœnissas*, ad *Medeam*—Ad *Iliada*—Ad *Pseudo-Solonem*—Ad *Eschylum*—Ad *Sophoclem*—Ad *Euripidem*—Ad *Comicum incertum*—Ad *Theodecten*—Ad *Moschionem*—Ad *Platonem Comicum*—Ad *Athenæum*—Ad *Anaxandridem*—Ad *Menandrum et Philemonem*—Ad *Theocritum*—Ad *Toupii Curas posteriores in Theocritum*—Ad *Alexandrum Ætolum Parthenii*—Ad *Anthologiam*—Ad *Herodotum*—Ad *Thucydidem*—Ad *Platonem*—Ad *Xenophontem*—Ad *Theophrastum*—Ad *Fragmenta Pythagoreorum*—Ad *Aristidem*—Ad *Pausaniam*—Ad *Hephæstionem*—Ad *Harpocrationem*—Ad *J. Pollucem*—Ad *Hesychium*—Ad *Photium*—Ad *Suidam*—Ad *Etymologum Magnum*—Ad *Codicem Alexandrinum*—Ad *Codicem Cantabrigiensem*—Ad *Codicem Rescriptum*—Ad *Codicem 17 = MS. Cantab. Kk. 6. 4.*—Detached Observations—Ad *Eunium*—Ad *Terentium*—Ad *Cic. Tusc. Disp.*—Ad *Livium*—Ad *Virgilium*—Ad *Horatium*—Ad *Juvenalem*—Ad *Priscianum*—Ad *M. A. Muretum*—On *Bp. Pearson*—*Bentleius Millio*—Boyle against Bentley—*R. B's* reply to Boyle—*Swift's Tale of a Tub*—*Lewis on Churches*—*Mr. Pope*—On *Bp. Warburton's Tracts*—Ad *Musgrævi Dissertationes Duas*—*Anderson's Poets*—*De Obitu immaturo Raphaelis*—Letter to the Rev. Dr. *Davy*—Appendix—*Sir John Hawkins v. Dr. Johnson*—Reproof valiant to Mr. *Travis's* Reply churlish—Errata—Addenda, Corrigenda—Auctarium—Indices.

The Section of History and Ancient Literature of the Royal Institute of France has published the two first volumes of its *Memours*.

The first volume, besides the history of the Section, and very elegant Notices on the lives and writings of Messrs. Julien le Loy, Germain Poirier, Bouchaud, Klopstok, Garnier, and Villoison; contains extracts of M. Gosselin's Researches on ancient Geography, of M. Visconti's memoir on two Greek inscriptions found at Athens, of M. Mongez' four memoirs on three inscriptions found at Lyon, and the masks of the ancients; and at full length, two capital Dissertations, titles of which are as follows: "Premiere memoire sur la nature et les révolutions du droit de propriété territoriale en Egypte, depuis la conquête de ce pays par les Musulmans jusqu'à l'expédition des Français: par M. Silvestre de Sacy." "Mémoire sur le Phénix, ou recherches sur les périodes astronomiques et chronologiques des Egyptiens, par M. Larcher."

In the second volume are to be found at full length: "Mémoire sur l'origine Grecque du fondateur d'Argos, par M. Petit Radal; Mémoire sur l'Art Oratoire de Corax, par M. Garnier; Observations sur quelques ouvrages de Panétius, par le même; Mémoire sur différentes inscriptions Grecques, par M. de Villoison; Mémoire sur les monuments et les inscriptions de Kirmanschah et de Biasntoun, et sur divers autres monuments Sassanides, par M. Silvestre de Sacy; Mémoire où l'on cherche à prouver que la Harangue en réponse à la lettre de Philippe n'est pas de Démosthène, par M. Larcher; Memoire sur la Restitution du temple de Jupiter Olympien à Agrigente, par M. Quatremere de Quincy; Doutes, conjectures, et discussions sur différents points de l'Histoire Romaine, par M. Levesque; Observations sur l'authenticité de l'origine de Rome, telle qu'elle est rapportée par Varron et par les Ecrivains Grecs et Romains, par M. Larcher; Recherches sur l'origine du Bosphore de Thrace, par M. de Choiseul-Gouffier; Mémoire sur la chronologie des Dynastes de Carie, et sur le tombeau de Mausole, par M. de Sainte Croix; Mémoire sur quelques inscriptions Arabes existant en Portugal, par M. Silvestre de Sacy; Mémoire sur les Charrues des Anciens, par M. Mongez."

Grande exécution d'Automne, No. I. WESTON.—Peking, vingtieme année Kia-hing, huitieme lune, jour malheureux—with this epigraph: *Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere Divos.*

The author of this little satirical pamphlet, printed in Paris by Michaud, is M. Julius Von Klaproth. His design is "de donner une critique générale de toutes les publications de M. Weston, qui fera voir clairement: 1.^o que M. Weston ne sait pas un mot de Chinois; 2.^o qu'il n'est pas en état d'écrire un seul caractère Chinois, sans le défigurer de la manière la plus barbare et le rendre tout a fait méconnoissable; 3.^o qu'il n'a pas la moindre idee de la prononciation des mots Chinois." We are told that in a future number will be examined the Chinese Lexicon of M. Deguignes.

Odes d'Anacréon, traduites en vers sur le texte de Brunck, par J. B. De S. Victor. Seconde Edition. From the press of P. Didot. To this very elegant translation the text and notes of Brunck are subjoined.

Professor BOISSONADE is preparing an edition of a Greek novel yet unpublished—*The Loves of Drosilla and Charicles, by Nicetas Eugenianus.*

Du Commandement de la Cavalerie et de l'Equitation : deux livres de Xénophon; traduits par un Officier d'Artillerie à Cheval. Paris. 8vo.

This artillery officer is M. Courier, already noticed in this *Journal*, vol. viii. p. 408. He has subjoined to his French translation an accurate edition of the Greek text of Xenophon, with very learned annotations.

Ouvrages Imprimés des Membres et des Correspondans de la Classe d'Histoire et de Littérature ancienne.

Les Fontaines de Paris, anciennes et nouvelles, par M. Moisy, avec une dissertation, des descriptions historiques, et des notes critiques, par M. Amaury Duval. 1813, in fol., fig.

Mines de l'Orient, par M. de Hammer, correspondant. Vienne, 1813 et 1814, tom. iii. et deux livraisons du tom. iv. in fol. fig.

Dictionnaire de la langue Française, par M. Gattel; édition revue par M. Champollion-Figeac, correspondant. Lyon, 1813. 8vo.

Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages des Chinois. Tom. xvi. publié par M. le Baron Silvestre de Sacy; (contenant la suite de la grande dynastie Tang, et un Mémoire du P. Gaubil sur la chronologie Chinoise). Paris, 1814. 4to.

M. Langlès a présenté à la Classe un exemplaire de la Chronologie Chinoise du P. Gaubil, collationné sur le manuscrit autographe.

Histoire des sectes religieuses, depuis le commencement du siècle dernier; par M. le Comte Grégoire. Paris, 1814. 8vo. 2 vol.

Description de la Grèce, par Pausanias, traduite en Français, par M. Clavier, avec le texte Grec. Paris, 1814. tom. 1er. 8vo.

Histoire Littéraire de la France, continuée par des membres de l'Institut (MM. Brial, Pastoret, Ginguené, Daunou). Tom. xii. Paris, Firmin Didot, 1814. 4to.

Traduction en prose de l'Enéide de Virgile; par M. Mollevault, correspondant. Seconde Edition. Paris, 1814. 8vo.

La Vie d'Agricola; par Tacite, traduite en Italien, par M. Gaetano Mariné; M. Grabert de Hemso, correspondant y a joint un Dictionnaire historique et géographique. 8vo.

Œuvres complètes de Xénophon, traduites en Français; avec le texte, la version latine, des notes critiques, des variantes, etc.; par M. Gail. Tom. i. 2e. partie, et tom. vii. 2e. partie. Paris, 1814. 2 vol. 4to.

L'impression de tout l'ouvrage, en onze volumes, est terminée.

This edition of Xenophon, in Greek, Latin, and French, by so celebrated a scholar as M. GAIL, is a truly valuable work, both to his countrymen and to foreigners. It combines the advantages of—1st. An accurate text, enriched with many new readings, the result of laborious application, and of large pecuniary sacrifices. 2d. A Latin version, frequently emended. As it contains above 40 plates, we are surprised at the cheapness of the work. The price of the 10 volumes, 4to. on common paper, is 160 francs; and 320 francs on fine paper.

To those who have not subscribed by the 1st of the ensuing June, the price will be 200 francs for 160, and 400 for 320.

M. GAIL has also published in 12 vols. 4to. fine paper, with plates, price 135 francs, an edition of Thucydides in Greek, Latin, and French, with variorum readings, and historical and critical notes. The edition in Greek and Latin, with notes and variorum readings, may be had separately from the French translation; price 110 francs in 10 vols. or 60 francs on common paper.

Isocratis oratio de permutatione, cujus pars ingens primùm græcè edita ab Andrea Mustoxidi (corresp.) nunc primùm latinè exhibetur ab anonymo interprete qui et notas et appendices adjunxit. Mediolani, 1813. 8vo.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

The First Number of the new and improved edition of *Stephens' Greek Thesaurus* will be ready for delivery in a very few days—The copies of deceased Subscribers are for sale till the 1st of March, after which the price will be raised from time to time according to circumstances. A detail of the general plan which is meant to be followed in the work may be had on application, or by letter [post paid], at No. 21 Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane, London. It is respectfully requested that such Subscribers as have not yet sent any reference in London, will as early as convenient favor Mr. A. J. Valpy with the name of some friend, or an order through a Bookseller, who may be authorised to receive the numbers and pay the Subscription.

Præf. Erasmi Rot. Concio de Pvero Iesv olim pronvnciata a pvero in Schola Iohannis Coleti Londini Instituta in qua præsidebat Imago Pveri Iesv Doctentis Specie. Editio Nova. The text will be taken from the latest Frobenian editions (viz. that annexed to Erasmi Enchiridion Militis Christiani, Bas. 1540, 8vo. and that in Erasmi Opera Omnia, Bas. 1540, folio,) which was adopted by Le Clerc, in Erasmi Opera Omnia, Lugd. Bat. 1704, folio. These editions have been collated with two others of earlier date (annexed to the Enchiridion Militis Christiani, Bas. apud Froben. 1519, 8vo. and Colon. apud Cervicorn. 1519, 4to.): and the principal Variations will be noticed at the foot of the page. The marginal notes of the early editions will be retained.

The edition now preparing will be uniform in size with the large paper copies of "Preces, Catechismus, et Hymni, in usum Scholæ Paulinae, MDCCCXIV;" and One Hundred Copies only will be printed for sale.

Two Greek and English Lexicons are preparing, Mr. Jones's and Mr. E. V. Blomfield's. The former was announced some years ago, in the First Edition of the author's Greek Grammar; the latter is a translation of Schneider's Greek and German Lexicon, with several valuable improvements and additions.

An English translation of Matthæi's Greek Grammar in German, is preparing for publication. We cannot but express our wish that the same honor were intended for Buttman's.

We hear that Mr. Gifford is on the point of publishing an English poetical version of *Persius*, to match his *Juvenal*.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

OUR correspondents will see by the size of this No., that we have not been so attentive to our pecuniary interest, as to the gratification of inserting their articles. Many are still delayed, but none neglected.

The scale of the merit of ancient poets would have been more just, if it had been drawn up by E. O. B. himself.

We wish that *nostri farrago libelli* should be as comprehensive as possible; but we cannot insert L. B.'s dissertation. Had it been more critical and less polemical, it would have been more adapted to our *Classical* and *Biblical* readers.

In our next No. we shall present to our readers a fac-simile of the *Elean Inscription*; accompanied by an illustrative commentary.

Abbé Morso's *Arabic Chart* is again postponed for particular reasons. The correspondent, who wrote on the subject of it some time ago, may be satisfied by calling on the Printer of this *Journal*.

To the advice relative to *Scarce Tracts*, our Constant Reader will find more than one on an average in each No. We shall certainly record one at least in all future Nos.

Obss. on the 24th Book of the *Odyssey* came too late for our sent No. It shall appear in the next, with any other articles of genius author may wish to appear in our pages.

P. R.'s Reply to Sir W. D. will have an early insertion.

L.'s Critique on Ossian's *Temera* has been received.

We are greatly obliged for the loan of W. Burton's *Tracts*.

Mr. S.'s *Coincidence of Passages in Ancient and Modern Authors* shall appear in our next.

The *Essay on Triposes*, with the *Tripes and Commentary*, came too late for our present No.

In our next, we shall give some account of two works published at St. Petersburg, a few months ago—one is the "*Dissertation sur le Monument de la Reine Comosarye*," and the other M. Ouvaroff's learned "*Essai sur les Mystères d'Eleusis*." Second Edition.

We shall also offer some remarks on Mr. Atkinson's "*Soohrâb*, an Episode extracted from the *Shahnamah*, of Firdûsi, the celebrated Persian Poet, and translated into Verse.

ERRATA.

No.	p.	l.
XXII	293	24 for Icetu read Tatu.
	306	28 -- principes - principia.
XXIII	208	2 vindicat
	211	17 Dt.

*. The Index to Vols. XI. and XII. will be given in No. XXV.

NO. XXIV.

Cl. II.

VOL. XII.

2 K

PROPOSALS
 FOR PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION,
 IN TWO VOLUMES ROYAL QUARTO,
 [Uniformly with Mr. TAYLOR's Translations of Aristotle and Plato.]
 A TRANSLATION
 OF THE SIX BOOKS OF PROCLUS,
On the Theology of Plato ;
 TO WHICH, A
 SEVENTH BOOK
 Will be added, in order to supply the deficiency of another Book on
 this subject, which was written by PROCLUS, but since lost;
 ALSO A TRANSLATION OF
 PROCLUS' ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY.
 BY THOMAS TAYLOR.

In these Volumes will also be included, by the Same,
 A TRANSLATION OF THE TREATISE OF PROCLUS
On Providence and Fate ;
 A TRANSLATION OF EXTRACTS FROM HIS TREATISE
 ENTITLED,
Ten Doubts concerning Providence ;
 AND,
 A TRANSLATION OF EXTRACTS FROM HIS TREATISE
On the Subsistence of Evil ;
 AS PRESERVED IN THE BIBLIOTHECA GR. OF FABRICIUS.

250 COPIES ONLY WILL BE PRINTED.

Price to *Subscribers* 5*l.* 5*s.*—To *Nonsubscribers* 6*l.* 6*s.*

Subscribers Names will be received by Mr. VALPY, 21. Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane, London, for the AUTHOR, who respectfully requests that a reference in Town, where the work can be delivered, and the amount received, may accompany the favor of the Subscription.

. The work is in the Press. The Subscription will close on the day of Publication.

